

2970050



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/contextstyleincl00harr>



CONTEXT AND STYLE IN CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

Evelyn Byrd Harrison

Interviewed by Richard Cándida Smith and Claire L. Lyons

Art History Oral Documentation Project

Compiled under the auspices
of the
Getty Research Institute for the History of
Art and the Humanities

Copyright © 1997
The J. Paul Getty Trust

COPYRIGHT LAW

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

None.

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATION

This manuscript is hereby made available for research purposes only. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publication, are reserved to the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Assistant Director for Resource Collections of the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities.

* * *

Frontispiece: Evelyn B. Harrison, circa 1995. Photograph by Rhoda Nathans, courtesy of Evelyn B. Harrison.

CONTENTS

Curriculum Vitae	vii
------------------------	-----

SESSION DATE: 29 MARCH, 1995 (245 minutes)

TAPE I, SIDE ONE	1
------------------------	---

Family background in Virginia — Childhood interest in art — Relation of drawing and verbal description in professional work with archaeological objects — High school education — Interest in science — Decision to attend Barnard College — Gertrude Hirst — Classical studies at Barnard — Studying epigraphy and ancient art history — Courses with Margarete Bieber and William B. Dinsmoor, Sr. — Influence of Gisela M. A. Richter and her interaction with Barnard students — How students were taught to see — Decision to focus on archaeology instead of art history or literature — Breadth of Gisela Richter's classical knowledge — Realizing the imminence of war — Becoming aware of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens — Graduate studies at Bryn Mawr and Columbia University — Rhys Carpenter and Mary Hamilton Swindler — Few fellow students in graduate school continued in the field — Carpenter's teaching style — Exposure to Karl Lehmann — Observations on difference between archaeologists and art historians — Postponement of graduate studies until after the war — Work for the War Department as a translator of Japanese transmissions.

TAPE I, SIDE TWO	18
------------------------	----

Development of interest in East Asian art — Returns to doctoral program at Columbia at end of war — Preliminary field examinations — Seminars and study projects — Student work on the east pediment of the Parthenon — Dinsmoor and Bieber as mentors — How today's seminars differ from those of the 1940s — Fellowship at the American School, 1948–1950 — Homer Thompson's role in choice of dissertation topic — Learning Roman art — Questions of patronage and style in antique art — Dissertation defense — Classes in Near Eastern and Egyptian archaeology — Technical and scientific training — Relation of sculpture to pottery finds in the Agora — Fellow

students at the Agora: Ellen Koehler, Evelyn Smithson, and Anna S. Benjamin — Lucy Talcott — Division of labor in the Agora — Gender relations at the American School — Benjamin Dean Meritt's work on epigraphy — Reasons for large number of women in the field.

TAPE II, SIDE ONE 36

Predominance of independently wealthy people in the field of archaeology — Hetty Goldman — Dorothy Burr Thompson — G.I. Bill helps to attract more men to the field — More on epigraphy: Lilian H. Jeffery and Michael Jameson — Gendered allocation of work in the French school — Salary discrepancies between men and women — Character portrait of Lucy Talcott — Alison Frantz — Importance of Lucy Shoe Meritt's work on profiles of Greek moldings — Homer Thompson's suggestions concerning Harrison's dissertation — Controversies over the dating of late Roman objects — Homer Thompson's administrative skills — Eugene Vanderpool's aestheticism — Questions of quality and attribution in classical sculpture — Relation of copies to originals — Input on dissertation from Bieber and Carpenter — Observations on intellectuals and scholars.

TAPE III, SIDE ONE 48

Harrison's book on archaic and archaistic sculpture in the Agora — Differences between methods and purposes of archaeology and art history — Classics department at the University of Cincinnati — Carl W. Blegen and Cedric G. Boulter — Debates over dating and style — Working with Lilian Jeffery — Gisela Richter's attempts to place archaeological objects in their historical contexts — Challenges to standard dating of Greek vases — Theodore Leslie Shear Jr.'s work in the Agora — How vase paintings can help in studies of sculpture — Harrison's work on Pheidias and Alkamenes — Debates over the Hephaisteion — Connections between the Agora and the Acropolis — Fitting fragments together — Teaching at Columbia University — Colleagues: Edith Porada, Jane Elizabeth Henle and Marion Lawrence — Meyer Schapiro — Reading in Athenian philosophy — Decorative style versus iconography.

TAPE III, SIDE TWO	66
--------------------------	----

More on iconography — Responses to "new archaeology" — Sally Humphreys — Colin Renfrew — Feminist theory and archaeology — Eva Keuls and Nicole Loraux — Comments on Martin Bernal's *Black Athena* — Changes in interests of students over the past thirty-five years — Attractions and drawbacks of Princeton — Move to Institute of Fine Arts in 1974 — Harrison's basic repertoire of classes — Closest associates in the field — Debates with Brunilde S. Ridgway — Mabel Lang — Comments on Andrew Stewart and his work — More on Evelyn Smithson — Harrison's current research interests — Her work on Pheidias.

TAPE IV, SIDE ONE	83
-------------------------	----

Competing forms of evidence — Iconography as a language that changes over time — Comments on semiotics — Reluctance to give opinions on classical objects — Getty kouros — On the questionable provenance of a Doryphoros — Thefts from the Agora and Aphrodisias — Judging fakes — Legal and economic ramifications of scholarly opinions — Social life at the American School — Afternoon teas — Work on personnel and publication committees of the school.

Index	93
-------------	----

Richard Cándida Smith, Assistant Professor of History at the University of Michigan, and Dr. Claire L. Lyons, Curator in Collection Development and Curatorial Projects at the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities interviewed Evelyn B. Harrison in her office at the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, New York City. A total of 4.1 hours were recorded. The transcript was edited by Katherine P. Smith.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Evelyn Byrd Harrison

Born June 5, 1920, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Education:

Barnard College, A.B., 1941

Columbia University, M.A., 1943; Ph.D., 1952

Professional Career:

1943–1945 War Department, Research Analytic Specialist

1948–1950 American School of Classical Studies at Athens

1951–1953 University of Cincinnati, Instructor in Classics

1953–1955 American School of Classical Studies at Athens

1955–1970 Columbia University, Department of Art History and Archaeology

1955–1959 Assistant Professor

1959–1967 Associate Professor

1967–1970 Professor

1970–74 Princeton University, Professor of Art and Archaeology

1974– Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, Professor of Fine Arts

Memberships and Honors:

Archaeological Society of Athens, Honorary Councillor

German Archaeological Institute

American Philosophical Society

American Academy of Arts and Sciences

Archaeological Institute of America, Gold Medal for Distinguished Archaeological Achievement, 1993

Publications (Partial):

The Athenian Agora I. Portrait Sculpture. Princeton, 1953.

"Fragments of an Early Attic Kouros from the Athenian Agora." *Hesperia* 24 (1955): 290–304.

"Archaic Gravestones from the Athenian Agora." *Hesperia* 25 (1956): 25–45.

Ancient Portraits from the Athenian Agora. Athenian Agora Picture Book 5. Princeton, 1960.

"New Sculpture from the Athenian Agora, 1959." *Hesperia* 29 (1960): 369–392.

The Athenian Agora XI. Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture. Princeton, 1965.

"The Composition of the Amazonomachy on the Shield of Athena Parthenos." *Hesperia* 35 (1966): 107–133.

"Athena and Athens in the East Pediment of the Parthenon." *American Journal of Archaeology* 71 (1967): 27–58.

"The Constantinian Portrait." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 21 (1967): 79–96. (Volume dedicated to Sirarpie Der Nersessian.)

"U and her Neighbors in the West Pediment of the Parthenon." *Essays in the History of Art Presented to Rudolf Wittkower*, eds. Douglas Fraser, Howard Hibbard, and Milton J. Lewine. London, 1967, pp. 1–9.

"The Victory of Kallimachos." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 12 (1971): 5–24.

"The South Frieze of the Nike Temple and the Marathon Painting in the Painted Stoa." *American Journal of Archaeology* 76 (1972): 353–378.

"Preparations for Marathon, the Niobid Painter and Herodotus." *Art Bulletin* 54 (1972): 390–402.

"The Portland Vase: Thinking it Over." *In Memoriam Otto J. Brendel. Essays in Archaeology and the Humanities*, eds. Larissa Bonfante and Helga von Heintz. Mainz, 1976, pp. 131–142.

"Alkamenes' Sculptures for the Hephaisteion: Part 1, The Cult Statues." *American Journal of Archaeology* 81 (1977): 137–178.

"Alkamenes' Sculptures for the Hephaisteion: Part 2, The Base." *American Journal of Archaeology* 81 (1977): 265–287.

"Alkamenes' Sculptures for the Hephaisteion: Part 3, Iconography and Style."

American Journal of Archaeology 81 (1977): 411–426.

"Notes on Daedalic Dress." *Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 36 (1977): 37–48.
(Essays in honor of Dorothy Kent Hill.)

"The Iconography of the Eponymous Heroes on the Parthenon and in the Agora." *Greek Numismatics and Archaeology. Essays in Honor of Margaret Thompson*, eds. Otto Mørkholm and Nancy W. Waggoner. Wetteren, 1979, pp. 71–85.

"Motifs of the City-Siege on the Shield of Athena Parthenos." *American Journal of Archaeology* 85 (1981): 281–317.

"Two Pheidian Heads: Nike and Amazon." *The Eye of Greece. Studies in the Art of Athens* (for Martin Robertson), eds. Donna Kurtz and Brian A. Sparkes. Cambridge, 1982, pp. 53–88.

"A Classical Maiden from the Athenian Agora." *Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture, and Topography Presented to Homer A. Thompson. Hesperia Supplement XX*. Princeton, 1982, pp. 40–53.

"A Pheidian Head of Aphrodite Ourania." *Hesperia* 53 (1984): 379–388.

"Early Classical Sculpture: The Bold Style." *Greek Art, Archaic into Classical. A Symposium held at the University of Cincinnati, 2–3 April 1982*, ed. Cedric G. Boulter. Leiden, 1985, pp. 40–65.

"Charis, Charites." *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* III. Zurich and Munich, 1986, pp. 191–203.

"The Classical High-Relief Frieze from the Athenian Agora." *Archaische und klassische griechische Plastik. Akten des internationalen Kolloquiums vom 22–25 April 1985 in Athen*. vol. ii, ed. Helmut Kyrieleis. Mainz, 1986, pp. 109–117.

"'Theseum' East Frieze: Color Traces and Attachment Cuttings." *Hesperia* 57 (1988): 339–349.

"Hellenic Identity and Athenian Identity in the Fifth Century B.C." *Cultural Differentiation and Cultural Identity in the Visual Arts*, eds. Susan J. Barnes and Walter S. Melion. *Studies in the History of Art* 27. Washington D.C., 1989, pp. 41–61.

"Repair, Reuse, and Reworking of Ancient Greek Sculpture." *Marble. Art Historical and Scientific Perspectives on Ancient Sculpture*, eds. Marion True and Jerry Podany. Malibu, 1990, pp. 163–184.

"The Dress of the Archaic Greek Korai." *New Perspectives in Early Greek Art*, ed. Diana Buitron-Oliver. *Studies in the History of Art* 32. Washington D.C., 1991, pp. 217–239.

SESSION DATE: 29 MARCH, 1995

[Tape I, Side One]

SMITH: The first question that we begin with has traditionally been, When and where were you born?

HARRISON: I was born in Charlottesville, Virginia, June 5, 1920.

SMITH: Could you tell us a little bit about your family background and what your mother and father did in life?

HARRISON: My father [William Byrd Harrison] and mother [Eva Detamore Harrison] both lived in Albemarle County, which is where Charlottesville is. My father was actually born in Richmond, but his family had moved to Albemarle County so he grew up in that region too, together with a lot of cousins. As a little boy he just went with his cousins to a kind of governess, and then he went into public high school. The public high school didn't have Latin, so he went to his mother for that. After a couple of years of public high school he went to the Miller School. Its original name was the Miller Manual Labor School, and it had been founded in the late nineteenth century by a man who wanted to provide job training for poor children and orphans of Albemarle County, but it developed into something more like a *Technische Hochschule*. My father was able to go from there into Virginia Polytechnic Institute as a sophomore. He did a degree in electrical engineering and worked at various jobs, but went back to teach at Miller School, so that's where my

parents were living when I was born. My mother had also been a teacher at that school. Her family lived in Charlottesville, but she had been born in Batesville, which is a very small town near Miller School.

The two sides of the family came from two halves of Virginia in a way. My father's family was from Tidewater and they had been slave owners—they had a lot of feeling for their past glory, etcetera. But of course after the Civil War they didn't have any money. My mother's family was from the Piedmont area. Her grandfather was a farmer and her father was a grocer, and they had had no stake in slave owning. My great-grandfather on my father's side was killed in the Civil War. My mother's grandfather had been called to be drafted by the confederate army and that was spring planting time and he saw no reason why he should join, so he just went home. Many, many years later it was discovered that he was classified as a deserter. When the Daughters of the Confederacy wanted to give an award to my cousin, who had slogged through in the infantry to Berlin in World War II, they looked [into his family history] and found that they couldn't do it because he was descended from a deserter.

So mother then was also at this Miller School and it was in what's known as the arts and crafts age, you know, so she taught not only drawing and painting but how to make woodwork objects and how to hammer copper pitchers and plates and the rest of it—all of that was called Industrial Arts. My mother and father met when they were teaching there and married, and for the first six years of my life I lived in

this nice place out in the country.

SMITH: It sounds like literature and art might have been an important part of your family life as you were growing up.

HARRISON: Yes. It was sort of evenly divided, because my father's mother had also done drawing and painting in an amateur way. I don't think she taught it, but there were a couple of paintings of hers, and a notebook with very lovely drawings of a precision which I never achieved, and then we had portraits around [the house]. I think that's where I got interested in figures and faces.

SMITH: Do you sketch as you do your research work?

HARRISON: Yes.

SMITH: So you learn the piece by doing it?

HARRISON: By sketching it and writing a very, very thorough description of it at the same time.

SMITH: Does the verbal description come out of the drawing or vice versa?

HARRISON: I think they both come out of the looking slowly, but I think I would probably start on the verbal description before the drawing, unless I were in a hurry in a museum or something like that. But there would be more than one stage with both.

SMITH: When did you start developing an interest in classical antiquity?

HARRISON: Well, this is a kind of a tradition thing, too. I think just from my father's saying that he had learned a little Latin in school, and that his father had even

learned a little Greek. This was kind of a spur, so that when in junior high school we had a choice to start first Latin or a modern language, I started Latin.

SMITH: Did you have brothers and sisters?

HARRISON: One of each.

SMITH: And what did they go on to do?

HARRISON: Well, my sister [Elizabeth] went on to be a housewife, which she still is, and she is the one that has produced more descendants than the others, though my brother [William] did pretty well, too. My brother started out working for the Federal Reserve Bank, then after a few years he discovered that the people who really had fun were the economists, so he put his family through the problem of his getting a Ph.D. at an advanced age, and then he became a professor of economics at Virginia Commonwealth University.

SMITH: Was your family religious?

HARRISON: Not extremely. We went to the Episcopal Church. My father had been confirmed, and my mother, who had grown up in the Methodist Church, was confirmed in the Episcopal Church when she married my father.

SMITH: Your middle name is Byrd, is that correct?

HARRISON: My father's mother was named Evelina, and my mother was named Eva. My father was named William Byrd, and this Byrd name was just handed on down. Evelyn Byrd was actually the wife of the first Harrison that married a Byrd,

you see, and so they gave me this combination, Evelyn Byrd, which had references in it to my father and mother.

SMITH: I asked because the Byrd family is a famous family from the seventeenth century.

HARRISON: Well, the Harrisons are not as famous from the seventeenth century, but they were there; the first one came in 1635 I think. He was literate, obviously, because he was the clerk of the council, but his wife signed her name with an "X". From then on, they went uphill until the Civil War, and then economically things were beginning to go down in Virginia.

SMITH: Now, they put your brother through a Ph.D. program. Did they also put you through one?

HARRISON: Well, the interest that they had put us through, but they didn't give us any money. When I spoke of my brother and his family, I [was referring to] his wife working and his children putting up with him not being there during the week, because he commuted to the University of Maryland. But I was on scholarships from when I first went to college.

SMITH: Where did you go to high school?

HARRISON: I went to high school in Richmond. It was a good high school. They had Latin, but they didn't have any Greek. They had French, Spanish, and German, and I chose French. It was called John Marshall High School, and it doesn't exist any-

more. But it was right next to the house where John Marshall, the chief justice, had lived.

SMITH: It was like a college preparatory school?

HARRISON: It was a southern, and I have to say segregated, high school, where there was just a lot of academic interest, and you could go one way or the other. You could do something called a commercial program, where you had to take typing and you were told your modern language should probably be Spanish, and things like that, or you could do a Latin program or a history program, or whatever you chose. I did the science program, partly because my father made me interested in it, and partly because I would have had to have more years of history if I had done the Latin program, and I wouldn't have had enough room to take the science all the way through. So that's what I did.

SMITH: And then you went to Barnard [College]. How did you choose Barnard?

HARRISON: [My choice was] partly economic and partly academic. Originally I was pointed by my Latin teacher to Randolph-Macon Woman's College, which is a good college, and still has a good classics department, but Barnard came recruiting, and it attracted me very much because I still thought that maybe I wanted to be an artist, and New York was where the art was. Barnard gave me a good scholarship, more money than Randolph-Macon would have given me. The only way that I could have gone to college cheaper would have been to go right in Richmond, which was

not academically as good.

SMITH: So you went to Barnard. What was your major?

HARRISON: My major was Greek and Latin, combined.

SMITH: Was it a classics program?

HARRISON: Well, not like the modern classical studies programs, where people don't have much language and they do history and the rest. This was the regular language courses. I had had the four years of Latin in high school, and I had to start the Greek in college, but I loved it so much I caught up.

SMITH: Who were your professors at Barnard?

HARRISON: Well, the professor of both Greek and Latin in the first few years was Gertrude Hirst, who was British. She had got a Ph.D. at Cambridge in something like 1893, with a dissertation on the cults of Olbia and she also used to tell us with pride that it was immediately translated into Russian. She had gone early into teaching and she never published much, but she was one of these rigorous teachers, and we didn't have many students in these classes then. She still had held onto a huge classroom that she had when Latin was required. So there was blackboard space, she could send us all simultaneously to the blackboard every day to put up our sentences that we were supposed to have written. It was a rather intensive education in an old-fashioned style, like Cambridge. She gave a wonderful course on Juvenal, Martial, and Pliny, which was really about the background of life under the empire.

SMITH: I was going to ask if the focus was philological or social.

HARRISON: The focus was definitely philological, but the social part was added in. Another professor, less powerful in pushing students around but more a scholar actually, was John Day, who taught Latin; he didn't teach Greek . . . no, he did actually. The *Odyssey* I remember. He was a very gentle, quiet man, and he had written a dissertation under Tenney Frank on the economic history of Athens in the Roman period. He also taught a little archaeology course, and there were very few students in it, but you could take it as a sophomore, which I did.

So we learned the main types of Greek art: vases, vase painting, terra cottas and so forth, and we learned what a kouros was and of course already there was the kouros in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, so once you were here [in New York] and you were interested in these things, there they were; you could just go down and look at them. Let me backtrack to the other professors. There was an epigraphist, and he was on leave when I took my first history course, but when I was a first-year, graduate student I took the epigraphy course with him, on inscriptions, and that was an influence.

SMITH: Did you study any art history?

HARRISON: I had one year of art history with Marion Lawrence, who was actually a medieval, early Christian scholar, but she taught the ancient art history. So I took that when I was a junior. Then as seniors at Barnard or Columbia, if you had a good

enough record and could get in, you could take graduate lecture courses. I had courses with Margarete Bieber and William [B.] Dinsmoor, Sr., and all of these courses we regarded as archaeology. Margarete Bieber and Gisela [M. A.] Richter gave a wonderful joint course on archaic Greek art. We alternated sessions with Miss Richter in the museum, and with Margarete Bieber in the lecture hall. I wrote a paper on hands and feet in archaic sculpture, and that was good training for somebody that would work in the Agora and just find pieces of things. Then I wrote a paper for Dinsmoor on tool marks on Greek sculpture in the Metropolitan.

SMITH: How were they teaching you to see?

HARRISON: Well, they taught you to see by putting you in front of the object or the slide as the case may be, and making you look at it.

SMITH: "Making you look at it"—what does that mean?

HARRISON: Well, you would be in front of the object, looking at it. There wasn't [the idea] that you had to be taught to see. We didn't have any formal analysis of a rigid, formalist art-historical nature. As archaeologists we just didn't do that. We looked for what the sculptor did or what the painter did, and what it was about, and what the date was, and then we just looked at the style in general. We had a lot of casts readily available in the Metropolitan at that time, because the war was already on, so they had put away a lot of sculpture and they got the cast collection out. We had all these kouroi and korai—that's how I could do the paper on the hands and

feet—in the regular exhibition rooms. We looked, for example, at the Berlin kore, which some people said was a fake, and Miss Richter just looked at it and called our attention to all of its features and said, "If it is a fake, I should like to shake the hand of the forger." Which was a personal opinion, but it was pretty convincing.

SMITH: Within this whole field of classical antiquity, you could have gone into literature or political history or social cultural history or art or archaeology. How did you wind up deciding on archaeology?

HARRISON: I wound up with archaeology because I was attracted to the literature and I was attracted to the art. Social history was already in the realm of sociology, and in what at Barnard they called Government. These were all very wordy sciences where you had to read a lot, and part of what headed me away from that was just that I'm a slow reader—was and always have been. With a difficult language you can read it as fast as anybody else, but with jargon in your own language you have to read whole pages, whole books, gulping them down. That was just too much work. I realized I wasn't going to be an artist or to be a writer in the creative sense, which meant digging down and pulling everything out of yourself; I didn't have that, but I did have a love of figuring things out. I liked math, I liked science, and archaeology was sort of in the middle of all of that. These people at Columbia, Dinsmoor and Bieber, Miss Richter, and the very firm and energetic Miss Hirst had organized the classical club, and this classical club had lectures. We students had to be the tea

pourers and the cookie bringers and I used to make the posters.

LYONS: It sounds very familiar.

HARRISON: That's where I met Dinsmoor for the first time, and Miss Richter came. Miss Richter met me and two of my friends, and we had all sort of decided which direction we were going. Miss Richter said, "What do you do?" The most loquacious of us said, "Well, Miss Harrison is an archaeologist, Miss Golann is a philologist, and I am in comparative literature." Miss Richter said, "How nice. The three of you together would be one classical scholar." [laughter] I thought that was good, because it was just the time when things split apart so much. People like Miss Richter were equally good at sculpture and vase painting. There isn't anybody now that you could even say that of. Martin Robertson is pretty close, but not quite.

SMITH: Is that partly because the literature on each subject has grown so much that it's difficult to keep track?

HARRISON: The literature grows, and the different methods that can be applied have multiplied. The time that you spend on the object is multiplied because more objects are available, and there's more communication between different parts of the world where the objects are. So you can't just talk off the top of your head about something without looking at the parallels, and that takes a lot longer. You can't totally ignore the literature because they may get something right; they often do. Neither can you be too respectful, or you end up with something like this book by

Barbara Vierendeel [-Schlörb], a catalog of the classical sculpture in Munich, which is a wonderful source of literature, bibliography and all of that, and was reviewed by Andrew Stewart as "this dinosaur of a book." If you try to keep up in the old way, not omitting any literature, then you have a dinosaur problem.

SMITH: At what point did you realize that there was going to be a world war?

HARRISON: Ah, that's a simple question. I think I probably realized it sooner at Barnard than I would have if I hadn't been there, because we came out of high school very much with the "our parents made mistakes we never would make" idea. In my freshman year at Barnard people were stirred up in various political directions. They were concerned about what was happening in China, or they were concerned about whether it was wrong to go to war no matter what, or whether it was justified in the cause of an oppressed class. So there was a lot of what would be called "liberal" thinking, but then there were points where you had to face how far you would push all of this.

When I was a sophomore—that would have been '38, '39—we had to decide what our majors were going to be, and that was the time when we really thought there would be a war. Dean [Virginia Crocheron] Gildersleeve, another powerful woman, very much concerned with international subjects, said, "You have to think about what your jobs will be." We didn't go on so much about careers, because this was still the depression; we needed jobs. She said, "Of course, if there's a war, you

won't have to worry, you'll all have jobs." And we realized she was right. So I think from then on we had the feeling it was going to happen.

SMITH: Did it affect your academic choices in any way, the fact that the world was plunging into war, and you might not be able to go to Greece for any foreseeable time in the future?

HARRISON: It didn't affect my choices because you couldn't see that clearly ahead. There were many students that were as old as I was when I got there, which was twenty-eight, but at the same time there were people as much as eight years younger than me who went [to Greece] at the same time. I traveled there in the second year in which it was possible to go. Now, I had had a lot of input about all the activities of the American School [of Classical Studies at Athens]—the excavations and so forth—from these Barnard courses and meetings of people. Dinsmoor was working on monuments in Athens, and [James H.] Oliver was publishing inscriptions from the Agora. The first year I was there Miss Hirst put into the *Barnard Bulletin* a letter from Isabel Kelly, who eventually became the wife of [A. E.] Raubitschek. She was a student at the American School in that year '37-'38, and she wrote back ecstatically of it all and the trips that they had gone on and the things that they had seen. I guess '39 was when everybody had to leave Athens, and of course many of the male professors went into [activities] related to the war. In my second year of graduate school I went to Bryn Mawr.

SMITH: But your degree is from Columbia?

HARRISON: My degree is from Columbia, but I went to Bryn Mawr because Columbia was very short of money for second-year graduate students. They would give you money for the first year, and then in the second year you were sort of left hanging. That still happens in places. But Dinsmoor and Rhys Carpenter, who was a professor of Greek sculpture at Bryn Mawr, were very good friends, and Dinsmoor advised me to go to Bryn Mawr, so I applied. Bryn Mawr was great because it meant that I had this whole other set of professors, including Rhys Carpenter and Mary [Hamilton] Swindler, who was the painting and vase painting person; she also had become very much interested in prehistoric Greek [material]. Then there was a man who had been a professor in Germany, and he had come over earlier than the main group of refugees. His name was Valentin Müller. He had a great interest in early Greek art and all of its connections with the Near East. There were just three of us graduate students at this point, taking the seminars, and we persuaded him just to give us a Near Eastern seminar, which he did. He had this very wide-ranging kind of mind and knowledge, so he was a great acquisition.

LYONS: Who were your fellow students, anyone that continued on?

HARRISON: Actually they planned to, but they didn't. One of them married a Canadian meteorologist. They moved to Australia, and she didn't go on being an archaeologist. Then there was the one girl who didn't seem the most serious, but

because she lived in Philadelphia she became a registrar at the university museum.

LYONS: What were professor Carpenter's courses like—his teaching methodology?

HARRISON: Well, this was a good, old-style seminar, which you could do with very few people and you didn't have to have slides. At Bryn Mawr they had a little seminar room with all the main books in it, so that you could just pull things off the shelf and show pictures on the table and so forth. Carpenter would give us something to work on for the next time, and then we would all talk about it together. He would lead us down the path that he wanted us to go, all under the guise that we were using our own eyes, and he would lead us to say something. He would say, "That seems pretty reasonable, doesn't it? Do you realize that that is rank heresy?" [laughter] So it was this kind of rebellion motif that you get so strongly in Brunilde [S.] Ridgway, that is coming out of his method. But there was this funny thing about him: he would go farther than you could go with his conclusions on anything, but even he knew that he was taking off into space a little bit, you know, and in that small kind of group you didn't have the "afraid to question the professor" attitude, so it was very fruitful.

SMITH: Did you have much interaction with the programs either at Princeton or here at the Institute [of Fine Arts] at this time?

HARRISON: At that time, none.

SMITH: You didn't go to hear Karl Lehmann speak then?

HARRISON: Well, occasionally I heard him speak. There was something that they used to have called Samothracian Evenings, where they would give you the results of the excavations at Samothrace, so I heard him then, but my orientation was not such as to be deeply impressed by him.

SMITH: Why is that?

HARRISON: I think that I didn't have a kind of a built-in respect for learning as learning; I think I was too American for that. I had respect for antiquity and evidence, but I didn't fall on my face because somebody had a vast amount of learning. There wasn't anything particularly charming about the way Lehmann spoke. Okay, I'm not going to make any more of those kinds of remarks. [laughter]

SMITH: Well, no, that's okay. We've interviewed a number of his students, and people who weren't even archaeologists but who were here at the Institute, and there's this sort of awe of him, and the position he holds in their memories may have a lot to do with his erudition.

HARRISON: It has to do with his erudition and maybe with the whole [notion] of making a discipline of art history as art history, which I was not [interested in], you see, because I was never defined as an art historian. The first time I ever thought that somebody would call me an art historian was after I published the first volume on the Roman portraits from the Agora [*Portrait Sculpture*]. [Hans] Weber reviewed it in German and he said that I really made an effort to give every piece its

"kunsthistorische" place. [laughter] I came to realize that by German definitions I probably was an art historian, but I had thought of art historians as going in for a certain kind of jargon, a certain kind of fixed method of analysis, and that was something that didn't seem to apply to me.

SMITH: You got your M.A. in '43, and at that point you don't continue on to the Ph.D. Was there a reason for that?

HARRISON: Yes, there was the good economic reason of running out of money, plus the Gildersleeve reason that it was easier to get a job, working in Washington. I went into a six-month program to teach people the rudiments of Japanese to the extent that they could translate very formulaic texts. We had one man who was a cuneiform specialist, and a lot of super-bright young men who did undergraduate pre-law at Yale were involved in this. They were drafted with the promise that they would become officers, and they sat around there doing kitchen patrol for years, while the ones who had gone into a similar program in the Navy had become officers immediately. Eventually they did become officers. There was one man from the post, a lieutenant, who was in charge of teaching them the proper form of how to be an officer. At the end of that they graduated and became first lieutenants before the war ended.

SMITH: But your job was to translate Japanese texts of one sort or another?

HARRISON: Yes.

SMITH: Do you still work in Japanese?

HARRISON: No. These texts came across in romaji. That means Roman (Latin) letters. So that's what we had in front of us. On occasion there was an indication of which character it was, because with a lot of words meaning different things, when you just put them in Latin letters, they come out with the same spelling. So you somehow had to do that. We knew enough to look up characters in the dictionary. I can still do that, but I don't remember them anymore.

[Tape I, Side Two]

HARRISON: It was certainly a broadening of outlook, and I became very fond of Far Eastern art while I was in Washington. They had to put away the Japanese art because they were afraid that people would take revenge on it, but there was lots of Chinese [art] and wonderful bronzes; all kinds of stuff was on view at the Freer [Gallery of Art] and so you could go around on free afternoons or mornings or whenever and look at it. We had little cultural and history lectures from people like [Edwin O.] Reischauer, who was the idol of a whole bunch of people. When I came back to Columbia I didn't want to let this just go completely, and so I signed up for a beginning Chinese course. I even took the next year's Chinese course, but I didn't get beyond that.

SMITH: Were you thinking in some way that you could do both classical and Chinese archaeology?

HARRISON: Not really I think. I just wanted to keep up this knowledge and this interest. I also took a course with Jane Gaston Mahler, who taught both Chinese and Japanese at Columbia; the Oriental art was a very small operation at that point.

SMITH: So you returned to Columbia at what point?

HARRISON: I returned to Columbia in the spring semester of 1946.

SMITH: So things were starting to get back to normal?

HARRISON: Things were starting to get back to normal and I had enough money saved up, so I could pay for my first term without having to get a fellowship. I thought I could get a fellowship for the next term, which I did.

SMITH: Could you tell us a little bit about the nature of the prelim fields that you wound up doing?

HARRISON: We didn't have a choice, really. If you were in Greek you didn't have orals. The smallness I think made that possible, because the English department even then had these orals which people went into psychological declines over. But we could take these exams one at a time, whenever you were ready for it. They were divided; some of the exams split into two. There was one that was architecture and topography, but they were two different exams. They were the ones I was most scared of because they were Dinsmoor's exams.

SMITH: Because Dinsmoor was unforgiving?

HARRISON: No, he just had very high standards, and he was kind of like a

grandfather figure; you didn't want to disappoint him. But I won't tell the rest of that story.

SMITH: No, you can.

HARRISON: Well, the last exam I took, the one I was the most scared of, was the architecture. For over a month I didn't hear anything about it, so finally I went in and asked Dinsmoor, "Was it all right?" He said, "Well, to tell you the truth, I haven't read it. I just assumed you passed." And I said, "Well, hold on to that assumption!" [laughter] Because meanwhile of course I had discovered a few little horrors that I had committed.

SMITH: What was the nature of the architecture exam?

HARRISON: It was pretty much the way it would be now. There were no slide questions, but you wrote about some question, and then there was some identification of terms and comments. That was true I think of the topography also. The big advantage of those exams was that in preparing for them I sat down and read whole books. I read all the way through [Walther] Judeich's *Topography of Athens*, and Dinsmoor's *Architecture of Ancient Greece* was in proof then, so I read all the way through the proof. And then we had an exam on vase painting.

SMITH: This was another field?

HARRISON: Another field, minor arts; part of it was vase painting and part of it was coins.

SMITH: Who was directing that field?

HARRISON: Margarete Bieber was the one who did the exam. But I studied for this vase painting exam at Bryn Mawr, because with that little seminar room it was just perfect. By then we had [John Davidson] Beazley lists, so I could get them out, and then I could pull out all the *Corpus Vasorum* books and things like that, and look up everything that was supposed to be by Euphronios and then I could do the same for other painters. It was sort of understood that the coins were not going to be such a serious part of the exam.

SMITH: Was the goal to be able to identify styles of particular artists or schools, or did you also interpret?

HARRISON: It was mostly writing about the styles of these artists. I remember the vase painting question I took; it was to distinguish between Euphronios and the workshop of Euphronios. I don't think I could do it now with Dietrich [von Bothmer] examining me, but . . . [laughter] Then we had something that was called Antiquities, which was like daily life, and that included Bieber subjects—theater and dress.

SMITH: So Bieber directed that?

HARRISON: Yes, she made up the exam and read it. And she did sculpture too.

SMITH: I see, okay. So there would be a standard sequence of exams.

HARRISON: You could choose what order you wanted to take them, but there were

what you would call subfields within Greek art.

SMITH: And you had taken seminars with each of these people?

HARRISON: Yes.

SMITH: Did they differ at all in terms of the way they handled their seminars?

HARRISON: Well, yes. Dinsmoor was actively working on the architectural monuments, and he would announce a seminar by a title that he could fit into what he was doing, such as analysis of Greek architecture, which was going into the dimensions and figuring out what the architect took as the main basis of the design and all of that. He often gave us buildings that he was interested in. One thing that he did was send us down to the Metropolitan to measure the diameter of the Sardis column. He said, "Just to see if the publication got it right." But we were so relieved when we came within half a centimeter of the publication.

Both Dinsmoor and Bieber had us do reports and in Bieber's seminars you also had to write a paper. In retrospect I'm not always very clear what I was doing, because we had to do reports in the lecture courses too, since they were a very small number of people. Dinsmoor had one course called The Parthenon Architecture and Sculpture, and I did a report on the east pediment.

SMITH: What would be involved in that report?

HARRISON: You read the most recent work on it, and then you would go back and see what that had changed, and you presented the evidence for the most recent work.

If you agreed with it you'd explain why.

SMITH: In terms of your own seminars and how they developed, how would you compare your teaching style in the seminar room with those of your primary teachers?

HARRISON: My style is much more affected by the formal, German tradition of seminars. Instead of having students informally reporting on the subject that they're supposed to have found out about, they do a kind of set piece that's really almost like a lecture, and then it is discussed by their colleagues the other students. I do ask them to give us the general background of whatever the problem is, but I don't ask them in my field to come to some brilliant new conclusion, because that's usually impossible; you just state in what direction you should go if you think the people have been wrong.

When you have these set pieces, a student whose seminar report comes at the end doesn't really have to do anything much in the first part of the term, and the other way around, you see. They are good at the discussion, but there is not this fact that at every meeting everybody has to have a certain readiness on the subject that we had in the old style small seminars with no slides. Just relying on slides formalizes things and makes it harder to go back and ask questions that come out of the middle of the [term] when the discussion has gone farther along. But I don't hold any brief for my style, I just adapt it to where I am.

SMITH: When you were a graduate student was source criticism something that was

considered important?

HARRISON: It depends on what kind of sources. If you mean going into the ancient texts and inscriptions, yes. They didn't call it source criticism, it was just part of the evidence you had to bring in.

SMITH: So you would problematize the evidence, the inscriptions, and so forth?

HARRISON: Everything is preproblematized; everything is a problem. You know, half the sculptor's name is there and the rest of it isn't—things like that. I'm simplifying it.

SMITH: How did you come to choose your dissertation topic?

HARRISON: Very, very simple; this is again pragmatic. I just fell into it. Under the influence of Mary Swindler, I had started to work on a dissertation that would have combined the various kinds of bronze work that were derived from Near Eastern art that turned up in early Greek art and had a strong influence on what early Greek art became. It would be three dissertations now. There were things like the griffins, and there were some reliefs called Cretan shields and there were bowls with this kind of metalwork. Well, for the first year in Athens your life is pretty much taken up with going around on these trips and learning things, and so forth, but we did have to write a paper, so I wrote a paper about griffins, just classifying them. Meanwhile, I had been on a trip to Samos, and I had seen, to my fascination but also horror, that there were huge numbers of these griffins that had been excavated in Samos by the

Germans. The Germans were not yet allowed back into Greece, so these were lying in the drawer, starting to have bronze disease. It was a situation where you realized that nothing could be done with these until the Germans came back, and when the Germans came back the Germans should be the ones to work on them.

So I was in the market for a subject, and Homer Thompson appeared. He was the director of the Agora excavations, but he was only there in the springtime. He had gotten the idea from Rhys Carpenter that I was good at sculpture, so he said, "We have a very fine series of Roman portraits and we really need to get some of this published." I said, "Well, that's fine, but I don't know anything about Roman art." He said, "It's time you learned." So what would have been an agonizing thing—finding a subject—suddenly became totally easy. The only thing was to do the work, which was not done perfectly; I got various things dated wrong and so forth.

SMITH: Did you then have to go back and learn Roman art?

HARRISON: I had had a survey course at Columbia with a man named Emerson Howland Swift. He lived in Princeton and commuted. He was said to have had a lovely garden in Princeton, and he led a gentlemanly life. He had these very well organized courses delivered in a very boring manner. I was never much of a note taker. In classes with Dinsmoor or Carpenter I took very few notes because I was too fascinated with what they were saying, but I found with Swift that I could take notes almost asleep, and they came out very well organized and informative, because

that's how his lecture was. So that was my Roman art essentially. But, you know, I started Latin very early and I knew a lot of Roman poets and the things that they talked about. Then I did take also a graduate course with Moses Hadas at Columbia on the topography of Rome. I had to give a report on the Pantheon.

SMITH: Were there areas of debate over your research topic and your dissertation?

HARRISON: Within the subject of Roman portraits made in Greece?

SMITH: Yes.

HARRISON: There was one principal area of debate, which was to what extent you could really say that they were Roman art when the artists were all Greeks. Under the influence of Margarete Bieber and the literature that I had read, I thought that you could say that there was a difference, but I formulated this difference in a way that sounded pretty much like those sources. Very much on the other side were Gisela Richter and Jocelyn [M. C.] Toynbee, and in the end, in a certain way, they were right. But both sides were right, so it was rather nice at my defense, because Miss Richter said, "Now you have a footnote here that says that the Greeks who went to Italy to work were influenced, and eventually even changed their styles to [accommodate] their patrons, and you add, 'As some European artists who have come to America have become Americanized.'" Margarete Bieber had suggested that I add that. So Miss Richter suddenly came out with this flood of names of European artists and asked me if I thought that they had been Americanized. So I laughed and I said,

"Well, I will leave the defense of that footnote up to the person who suggested it."

And Margarete said, "The only thing wrong, Gisela, is that we should also have said, 'and scholars,' because everyone says how American you are." [laughter] So I would think that in the field, that was what would be called a burning question of which I was on the side that was not the wave of the future.

SMITH: Is that because of Margarete Bieber's theoretical approach, or her perception of the thing?

HARRISON: No, there was a German scholar, Bernhard Schweitzer, who wrote this very interesting book, which I read and absorbed, on Roman portraits and Roman ancestor portraits and how they changed style over the generations. In a certain way his basic idea was right, but where he was wrong was that he dated these marble portraits on the basis of coins. The coins represented people who had lived back in the end of the second century and the beginning of the first, but coins were not issued until the middle of the century, about the time of the coins of Julius Caesar. So, in fact, the style that was in those coins was really more the style of the forties, and not of that period, and that gave a kind of priority to some of these so-called Roman qualities. Then Bert [R. R. R.] Smith did his dissertation on the portraits of Hellenistic rulers, some of which had these qualities that would be like what people used to call Roman verism, and he established that those were all rulers who were clients of the Romans. So that attitude of rugged realism was something that we sort

of made up. Between realism and verism there was this slightly artificial distinction made. There were all these terms; things that were made into "isms" were fully afloat in those days.

SMITH: But surely it's possible for the one artist to work in different styles, depending on the situation of where the art work is going to go, isn't it?

HARRISON: It's just a question of to what level you are taking the term "style." And if you take it to the most inclusive, which means, How does Picasso's classical period [work] look like a fashion magazine of the 1920s? you can't just translate yourself back into the way of seeing that people had a long time ago. You can just translate yourself back into the way you see that art, and it will always be different, because it will always be of your time. And this is why, as people observed so long ago, that it takes a while to recognize a modern fake, but eventually it becomes clear to everybody.

SMITH: You did say you had a class in Near Eastern archaeology.

HARRISON: At Bryn Mawr, yes.

SMITH: What about Egyptian?

HARRISON: There were two things. I didn't have a class given by an Egyptologist in Egyptian art, but in the ancient art surveys there was Egyptian art, and with the combination of the Metropolitan and the Brooklyn Museums, the amount of good Egyptian art to be seen was just about unrivaled. So that if you were naturally

inclined to be fond of sculpture, then you really loved Egyptian art, and because pharaohs came with dates and things like that, you didn't have to struggle much; you just read the label. The other thing was that Bieber gave a kind of survey in which the first half was Egyptian and Mesopotamian, but this was not going into the Near Eastern in the depth which Müller went into it. I mean, for example, Bieber didn't do anything about the architecture, which Müller did.

SMITH: What about Anatolian art, or art from Asia Minor?

HARRISON: Well, that came into Müller's wide-flung net, and also Mary Swindler with her interest in early prehistoric Greek [included] some of that in her courses.

There was not the strong focus or the excavation connection that there is now at Bryn Mawr.

SMITH: Did you have any training in chemistry, mineralogy, geology, or any of those kinds of things?

HARRISON: All of this was in high school. The first year was just called physical geography, and that was a kind of kiddie geology. And then I did take a regular geology course at Barnard.

SMITH: As part of your thinking that you would be an archaeologist?

HARRISON: Yes.

SMITH: Was it a required course?

HARRISON: It was required to have one science course.

SMITH: But not necessarily geology?

HARRISON: But not necessarily geology. But all of the science was on a pretty high level; it was before the reactor age, and so whether you could have the highest level equipment or not wasn't as much of a problem. So they had good science and they had good math. Chemistry, though, and physics I just had in high school. We did these experiments in pairs, so I would always team up with a boy that could set up the equipment, and I could do the math. And that way we could get through with this.

SMITH: Did you have any training in surveying?

HARRISON: Not actually, no. I knew about what surveying was, because my father did it; I could look through a transit but I didn't actually have training.

SMITH: So your training as a field archaeologist is then all on site at the Agora?

HARRISON: Yes, and I never got very far, really, as a field archaeologist. I just dug as a student because the sculpture doesn't come out of good contexts.

SMITH: Pardon?

HARRISON: Sculpture does not come out of good contexts.

SMITH: Explain that to me.

HARRISON: All right, what you mean by a good context is something that will date the things that the sculpture comes out of, because sculpture gets broken up and re-used. It's not like pottery which you just break up and throw down the slope and then

other stuff gets dumped on top of it. With the sculpture, some of it gets re-cut, and little things are made from bigger things. As soon as you get to the period of making buildings with rubble and lime mortar, as in the later Roman period in the Agora, then people are breaking up the sculpture and turning bigger chunks into the stones of the rubble and burning up the other for lime. You just find the stuff that's left. The broken up pieces are what you find more of. And where you can't get them together because things are missing, that's what went into the lime.

SMITH: Could you just describe for us a little bit how the Agora project integrated students into its activities, what you were told to do and how they trained you to do it, and then the kinds of options that became open to you. You were there for how many years?

HARRISON: The first time I was there for two years. I went for one year on a fellowship of the American Association of University Women because Mary Swindler was on that committee and I could get that, and then the second year they instituted the Fulbrights. Because the guerrilla warfare was still going on in the mountains, a lot of people just didn't want to come to Greece, so anybody that was already there and wanted to stay could get the Fulbright. Our whole class, except for Harry Carroll, who had committed himself to a teaching job for the next year, stayed and got Fulbrights. So that was two years. When I first arrived, some of the others had come before I did, because those that were just in college could go in August.

SMITH: So this was in 1949 when you went?

HARRISON: The summer of '48, but it started in September. Mary Swindler had told me that the fellowship was not enough to live on in Athens, so it would be a good idea to go back and work another year. I went back to this place in Washington, reading a different language, and I worked for a year, so I couldn't go early. Ellen Koehler, Evelyn Smithson and Anna [S.] Benjamin, who was from Penn, had all gone in August, so they immediately went down to the Agora and were put to work doing various things in the cataloging section.

When I came we immediately had to start doing our program, so I didn't get down there right away, but Lucy Talcott, who was the head of the records department and an expert on red-figure vase painting, said to me, "You haven't been down to the Agora. You must come." So I went down to the Agora, and they had these photographs of sculpture, and they didn't know how to classify them. Lucy Talcott said, "Now, of course we realize that only Mr. Carpenter could tell you the real dates of these, so we won't try to make you do that." I agreed that I couldn't. I wasn't even sure that Carpenter could. I just decided that we would classify them by male and female and then by nude and dressed and then by what kind of dress and if they were only heads, the males would be bearded and unbearded, and the females would have their various coiffures but very simplified. It wasn't a good classification, but they never found a better one and in the end they just said that you had to know

what you wanted and you had to then put the things in by their inventory numbers. Anyhow, that was interesting because I could sit there in this catalog room. Other people later came to feel you had to be privileged to be there. There was a woman who is still in Athens, Judith Binder, and she was very annoyed if people on the wrong level came into the catalog room and sat down. [laughter]

Now I don't know whether Ellen Koehler had had more chemistry, or what it was, but she had gotten into trying to treat the bronzes and the lead curse tablets. They found that there wasn't anything on how to do it; she consulted all kinds of people. They were then doing the bronzes according to an old-fashioned method, which they soon abandoned, and Ellen really sort of developed her own [techniques], which she used when she went to Gordion. They came out very well and then they had more up-to-date methods from people in Italy and in London. So different people were given different things to do. I think Anna, who was really a philologist, was supposed to do a catalog of the ostraka and the lead curse tablets and she consulted her sister back in Philadelphia, who was a chemist, who said there wasn't anything much you could do about unrolling these things. Eventually they found ways to do it.

Evelyn Smithson did an M.A. in Bryn Mawr on Cycladic pottery, the early iron age pottery of the islands, so she wanted to work on pottery, and there was the Protogeometric pottery in the Agora. That and the Kerameikos [material] was also

accessible and had been published by these German scholars who, being Nazis, were not allowed at that time to come back. So Evelyn got that to work on from the beginning. Like the Roman portraits, there was a significant amount of Protogeometric pottery. I think they felt they ought to get it done, and Lucy was not going to do the early stuff.

So that's what they did. As the students came in, they were looking out for people that could do things, so there was no problem getting into the Agora. The Agora was a little unfriendly when I first got in there; it seemed like a closed thing. When I first went in there were these three women who became very close friends of mine, but they were already in there and I wasn't, you know. There was something about the place. . . people were not made to feel at home there; it was just that we had these things to do, and everyone worked on their own things.

SMITH: What was the nature of the gender relationships?

HARRISON: Well the gender relationship was hardly a factor, except I could say that they never had a director of the whole excavation that was a woman. But because the availability of women was so much greater than the availability of men, there were more women than there were men supervising trenches..

SMITH: Do you think there was a difference in the kinds of tasks that were assigned to men versus women?

HARRISON: Well, it happened that there was one man who dominated the

epigraphy, the inscriptions of the Agora, that was Benjamin [Dean] Meritt, but it was more Meritt dominated than it was male dominated. The architect of the excavations was John Travlos, who was Greek, from the Polytechnion in Athens. He and Homer Thompson worked together from the beginning on architecture. Eugene Vanderpool had broad interests in things that hooked on directly to history I think, so that he was interested in epigraphy, he was interested in topography, and he was interested in Attic vase painting, black figure particularly, and the ostraka. Being interested in all those things, and having become gradually the sort of mentor in general archaeology of the students at the school, he started working on all this material and he published articles, but he never completely published any of these. So Mabel Lang, for example, who first went to the school the year before I was there, then came back to Bryn Mawr, and she took over and published the ostraka from Vanderpool. She did various other things that were on the edge of the epigraphical, like the weights and measures. Coins were definitely not gender specific, because Josephine Shear was the one who started out doing the Agora coins, and then it was Margaret Thompson. Since then there have been men doing them.

LYONS: All along, many of your professors and colleagues were women. You went to women's colleges. Was that important to you? Was it a conscious choice, something you felt was to be pursued?

HARRISON: I didn't pursue going to a coed place because I was really looking for

someplace that was good in the subject. I wasn't thinking about going off to Berkeley; nobody was going to offer me a scholarship to go to Berkeley. I was really looking in the east coast range. Gilbert Highet had taught me Latin in my last year at Barnard, and the upper levels of Latin and Greek had so few students in them that they combined Columbia College and Barnard, and the ratio was three women to one man in both of those. The man in Greek was Donald Keene, who went into Japanese and stayed there and became a great scholar in Japanese literature. The man in Latin went into law school, which was what he was going to do anyhow.

LYONS: So the great number of women in the field was very much due to the fact that Bryn Mawr and some of these other colleges were so strong in producing female students?

HARRISON: But more than that, overall, the great number was because everybody always knew that archaeology was not something that you would ever make a profitable career in. So for the most part, these men and women had their own money.

[Tape II, Side One]

HARRISON: Hetty Goldman was one of the pioneers who conducted excavations, and she took Bryn Mawr women to the excavations. She dug at [Tarsus] and also Boeotia. People like Dorothy [Burr] Thompson had worked with her—she was a Bryn Mawr person also. Hetty Goldman was from the kind of family where the

women either married or they could do what they wanted to with their money. I don't know how much money Harriet Boyd Hawes had, but she must have had enough to get along. Directors of the Agora after Homer Thompson have been people with their own money. The director of our institute now is a person like that, and he directs Samothrace. In the Depression [this field] had no attraction for men. But immediately after the war, when we had the G.I. Bill, people could go back to school and take pretty much what they wanted and not have to be dependent on asking for scholarships, and then there was a lot of demand in the humanities. Gradually more men took these jobs, so then the dynamic worked back to what it would have been in fields like engineering or whatever.

SMITH: Do you think that women's opinions and scholarly positions were treated with the same degree of respect as men's at this time?

HARRISON: I think so, yes.

SMITH: Women did have greater difficulty getting academic jobs in general. Was that also true in archaeology?

HARRISON: No, because there were hardly any men there to take them. One person that I think of as my contemporary in this, but he's actually five years younger than I am, is Mike [Michael] Jameson. He's about the only man that was really my contemporary, doing the kind of thing that I did. He did epigraphy, but then the person who did the great work on archaic epigraphy, Lilian [H.] Jeffery, had started

on that already at an earlier time. She and I got together in the early fifties when I went back there. The French school said that they had this division: men did architecture, sculpture, and epigraphy, and women did pottery and small objects, but it didn't really stay that way because women went into epigraphy—and into architecture now at Delphi.

SMITH: Were women paid as much as the men at that time?

HARRISON: In academic salaries, I don't think so. In this field they weren't paid much. If you were, as I was, in the Columbia art history department, then you didn't know what other people were being paid, but I feel sure that men were being paid more.

SMITH: You had mentioned a little bit about Lucy Talcott. Could you just discuss her as a personality?

HARRISON: She was another one of these powerful women, but she was both powerful and devoted, so that she could be a little bit self-abasing and even a little bit martyred at times. She ruled this records-keeping operation, and she really felt that the material should be available to people who were working seriously on it and who were going to go farther on it than somebody right there. So she had a regular exchange with Beazley, for example, and whenever painted Attic pottery that seemed as if it might be attributable came out, she would send it to him.

SMITH: A photograph or the actual piece?

HARRISON: The photograph, not the actual piece. You cannot send actual pieces out of Greece. She would send him the photograph and tell him what painter she thought it might be. If he agreed, then he would [credit] the attribution to her. He also did this for excavators who sent something in. So as far as that branch was concerned, there was no sitting on the material, and the tendency was to let people see anything that you were working on, but once you were assigned a body of material, somebody couldn't just come in and say, "Well, my professor in Heidelberg wants me to do a thesis on this. Can I have this instead of you?" You couldn't do that.

Lucy was the one who greeted the visitors and gave them the access. She did it with extreme graciousness; she spoke all kinds of languages, always with an American accent, but fluently, so if you go through prefaces of people you find all of these statements of gratitude for her help, her hospitality, and the rest. At the same time, for the young ones working under her, she was a little bit domineering; she thought you ought to do it her way, and so you had to maneuver around that a little bit.

SMITH: Was she helpful to you in terms of your dissertation? Did she have helpful insights?

HARRISON: No, and I'll tell you what the trouble was. The first director of the Agora, [Theodore] Leslie Shear, Sr., had the feeling that whatever was the most

noticeable to the public was the property of the director to publish, so he published a lot of the sculpture and he started the tradition that any striking pieces of sculpture that came out got published with a picture in *Hesperia*, and you couldn't say, "No, you can't have that." But I don't think that he was particularly open to other people's opinions about things. I think that Lucy had this tremendous admiration for Rhys Carpenter, even though she hadn't been a Bryn Mawr student, she had been at Radcliffe. But Carpenter had been the director of the school when she first started there at the Agora, and she really worshipped him. So she had this lofty opinion about sculpture, and I think her comment to me about Mr. Carpenter being the only one who could really date these sculptures shows her attitude. So she didn't want to have anything to do with it in a certain sense, and I always felt that she was not as cozy with me as she was with the people who were doing pottery.

SMITH: And Alison Frantz you must have known quite well. Could you give us a little character portrait of her and her kind of role in the school?

HARRISON: Well, she was very intelligent, very much a lady, but not with all of these ladylike airs and graces, you see. She was the photographer; she drove a car and at that time there were not too many women driving cars in Athens. People would, yell, "Soferina!" at her, which means female chauffeur. She was a rather strong person too. She and Homer Thompson were very close. Lucy sort of manipulated that relationship.

SMITH: To what ends?

HARRISON: Just to the ends of being in control of everything in the Agora. That's as much as I'm going to say about that subject. Lucy helped me very much just by this machinery being there, that I could work under, but I wouldn't ever have called her a mentor. The only thing that I would put forward as a real example was this desire of hers to make the material available, and to treat the visiting scholars as guests and helpers and not as people who were coming to steal your thunder.

SMITH: The other central woman at the Agora was Lucy Shoe Meritt.

HARRISON: She was not at that time on the Agora staff. But she was a Bryn Mawr graduate and a Carpenter product. Neither Alison nor Lucy were Bryn Mawr graduates, but Lucy Shoe was a student of Rhys Carpenter's, and for whatever reason, maybe because he thought somebody ought to do it and she had the energy and persistence, which she surely did, to do it, she did her dissertation on an architectural subject, which was the profiles of Greek moldings. It was a heroic job getting all these profiles, it was a heroic job publishing them, and this work has been an indispensable help [within the field] ever since. I think she had a teaching job at Holyoke for a year or so and didn't get tenure, but I don't know what that situation was. Then she took up residence at the Institute for Advanced Study, having become the editor of *Hesperia*. As the editor of *Hesperia* she was working hand in glove with Meritt, because Meritt was publishing the inscriptions regularly in *Hesperia* and

a good part of the text in there and of the indexing job and all the rest was these inscriptions. So Meritt came to have considerable influence on *Hesperia* policy. Within the in-fighting world of epigraphists there were certain anti-*Hesperia* feelings.

Lucy Meritt has continued to work on architecture, and she is now almost ninety and she's losing her sight, which makes it hard for her to do this anymore, but she was publishing what we have so much of—good architectural fragments, not attributed to buildings. So both her book and her opinions are valuable. I don't think that she and Lucy Talcott probably cared much for each other, but they didn't get in each other's way; they weren't there at the same time.

SMITH: You had mentioned that Homer Thompson suggested your topic. Did he continue advising you as you were working on it?

HARRISON: Oh, yes. He gave me good practical input, about types of marble, about weathering and things like that, about what the meaning of the place where the thing was found might be. He gave me some input that out of diplomacy I took which I shouldn't have, [such as] perhaps going too far on the side of Roman art being really different. But he had very strong feelings that when Athens was sacked by these barbarians in 267, that it just put a stop to everything, and he didn't really recognize the extent to which some of these arts and crafts went on and some even flourished later. So there was a kind of pressure to date things before this [invasion], and I looked for rationalizations for this and could find them but they weren't right,

you see.

SMITH: Have you changed your opinions or changed the dates on some of these pieces that you've published—sort of self-criticism?

HARRISON: Yes, but I don't publish it with this great self-criticism. We later put out a picturebook on portraits, so my [revised] dating is in the picturebook.

SMITH: Based on new information?

HARRISON: Based on seeing more of the parallel material and also there was new information from the pottery people on various things, as they worked more on the late antique period.

SMITH: I'm not asking this as a trick question, but if you could give your sense of Thompson as an executive of this project, and how well he kept things together and moved things?

HARRISON: I think that "executive" is just the right word, because I think he was superb at that. Owing to his very businesslike approach, he had very unrealistic assessments of how long the publication would take, of how much it would cost, and the rest of that, but in keeping the operation going and in keeping on the right side of the Greek services, and in keeping up the interests of donors, he was superb—also in taking an interest in the students who came in. But when you look back then at his publications he was pushing everybody to publish things as fast as possible, but the only book-form publication he has done has been with collaborators. So you can be

one thing or the other, but I really think for the Agora his qualities were the most serviceable for a big operation like that.

SMITH: Did you have much interaction with Eugene Vanderpool?

HARRISON: I had a fair amount of interaction with him, and I liked him very much. Everybody liked him, he was one of these irresistibly likeable people. Like the elder Shear he had a little of this attitude of pretending not to like sculpture unless it was something very beautiful. So if you would find a join, say, a head from a gravestone, of a man in a traveling hat, and there is a poem above it, it's very nice as a fragment. But then I would find on the shelves another fragment that had part of his cloak, and I [make this join] and everybody says, "Oh, congratulations! Isn't that great to know what his cloak was like," or whatever. And Gene would just shake his head and say, "Well, before it was a nice fragment." Once we got a very sexy, thinly dressed, big-breasted Aphrodite, which he never liked. [laughter] So he had too much good taste for sculpture.

SMITH: You teach art history. How have you handled the quality question?

HARRISON: I just say whether I think it's good or not.

SMITH: Is that an issue that organizes the class?

HARRISON: No, because if you teach something like what I'm doing this term, which is fourth century, the amount of original material that you've got is so small, the question of attributing sculpture to known sculptors and all the rest of it has to be

built up out of drawing conclusions from copies that are of all different qualities. So you have to go into the quality of the copy, but then you have to look into the methods that they used and find out how the methods of copying and the material they are copying in affects this. You have to do what you would call source analysis, except that the sources are also sculpture. If you will excuse me for saying it, when museums acquire things that are genuinely low quality or ugly, I think you have to deplore a little bit that they took this low quality, ugly stuff out of its context, where it would have at least had some use, and put it on display. Also, you have to [judge] quality in terms of what the work was meant to be for. It's clear that ancient critics of art cared a lot about skill of technique, and I think it would follow that ancient patrons also cared about it—they paid for it. There were always people who would like a bigger one that cost less if it's not finished as much. You can see among the Acropolis korai that in general the biggest are the best, but every now and then you run into a great big one that clearly is not that good, and you think that that guy just wanted a big one but he didn't want to pay that much to get that artist or to get that amount of work.

SMITH: Was Vanderpool's kind of aestheticism something that has been a factor in your field?

HARRISON: Not very much; I think it was very individual to him. He would just shudder if anybody called him an art historian. In fact I can tell you a story there.

Vincent Scully came to Athens and he and Vanderpool became great friends; they just liked each other, and Scully became a Vanderpool worshipper. They went on a trip, going around looking at temples in Greece and Asia Minor. Gene came back, and people said, "What did you think of Scully and his ideas?" He said, "Oh, it's just another world, that art history." So if you know enough about Scully, then that would give you an idea.

LYONS: Is that the trip where Scully began to develop ideas of siting?

HARRISON: Well, he was researching his ideas of siting. And Gene said that sometimes it was funny. They were approaching Klaros, and Vince looked up and said, "That looks like an Apollo site." Sometimes he seemed to have gotten it. There was a time when Scully came and gave a talk at the Metropolitan, and Gene was there and came up and greeted him afterwards, and Scully said, "Oh, if I had known you were here I wouldn't have been able to say a word!" [laughter] If you can imagine Scully not being able to say a word.

SMITH: No, that's not his reputation, certainly. Did you discuss your dissertation project with Vanderpool?

HARRISON: I don't think I discussed the Romans with him; when I was doing the archaic material I did. He could get a little more interested in the archaic.

SMITH: The next time we get together, we'll start with the archaic and archaistic material. What about Rhys Carpenter?

HARRISON: This is back to the dissertation—

SMITH: Right.

HARRISON: He was still at that time the one who on the books had the assignment of all the sculpture from the Agora; he wasn't about to do Roman portraits, but he was a reader for my dissertation, so I did get quite a bit of input from him. Margarete Bieber and he both read my first draft and gave substantial input, and then he asked very good questions on my defense.

SMITH: Anything specific you can remember?

HARRISON: I can remember one place where he wrote back, "I feel rather strongly that two of your"—and he ostentatiously crossed out "your"—"the' heads are out of place." [laughter] One of them he was certainly right about and maybe the other one he was too.

SMITH: At this time were you doing any reading in anthropology, or contemporary stuff like Freud, Jung, Frazier, or Ruth Benedict?

HARRISON: No.

SMITH: Did you have any interest in contemporary cultural and intellectual trends?

HARRISON: Not much. I never felt like an intellectual.

SMITH: No?

HARRISON: No.

SMITH: Why not?

HARRISON: Because there was a certain pretentiousness it seemed to me that the intellectuals had.

SMITH: But you were a scholar.

HARRISON: That was completely different. The intellectuals didn't really consider that scholars were intellectuals, necessarily. They had their own categories.

[Tape III, Side One]

SMITH: I wanted to resume with your book *Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture*, which was also an Agora project publication. Was that also at Homer Thompson's suggestion?

HARRISON: Yes it was, because he really was the director and Rhys Carpenter wasn't really interested in doing all of this stuff. I got my degree and I taught in a replacement job at Cincinnati for two years, and then Homer Thompson wangled me a fellowship to go back [to Athens] and start doing other Agora sculpture on the basis of my work on the portraits. He said, "You know how to make the most out of our kind of material," which was, you know, [in] a kind of condition that didn't appeal to every person. The logical thing was to start from the archaic and work through, but the reason I decided to do archaic and archaistic together was that there really were a few pieces that presented a question as to whether they were archaic or archaistic, including some types that were not exclusive to the Agora but the Agora had lots of them, which were the herms and the Hekate figures, which would both be classed as

archaistic. So I had two years there then because the second year I got a Guggenheim to continue on this.

SMITH: You seem to be moving more into directly art-historical kinds of questions in that work. Were you beginning to study art history?

HARRISON: You would have to explain what you mean by more definitely art-historical questions before I could say.

SMITH: When I looked at the book it seemed that you were beginning to discuss form and it was becoming more evaluative—maybe that would be a way of putting it—and constructing an argument based on the form.

HARRISON: Well, the argument is based on the form in the portraits too, but I think you have more external considerations, [such as] the relations to imperial portraits. Also, they were all heads, you see, and there were lots of crumbs of these bodies, all rather stereotyped, and so I just published the well-preserved ones as the examples. But when you come to the archaic, you have come to something where it's fairly easy to talk about the forms, and that's what you are going on, so I don't think that I was more or less art historical in either one of them. I don't think that there was any particular influence on me. In the department at Cincinnati where I taught, there was no art history department. There was excellent ancient art and archaeology in the classics department, and there was a school of fine arts, which meant architecture, and things like that. Cedric [C. G.] Boulter, who was a vase-painting man in the red-

figure league was there, and then there were epigraphists, and there was Carl [W.] Blegen, who was the excavator of Troy and Pylos. He had been the director of the American School the first year I was there as a student, so I got to know him very well. That's how I got that job. He was one of the great influences too on people that were at the school. You wouldn't call him an art historian, but you would [analyze] things by their forms; you would do the prehistoric pots more by the form than later things that would have an inscription on them that said, "Euphronios painted me."

SMITH: You started working on that book in the mid-fifties, it took ten years before it was published. Did it take you that long to write it, or did it have to do with the publication schedule of the Agora project?

HARRISON: It's a mixture of the two, and it had to do with teaching. It had to do with being the kind of person who doesn't work very fast, but in those ten years I worked on other things. I wasn't in the Agora with blinders on, since I knew that I was going to go ahead to other things. I wasn't spending all of my time just specifically on the archaic things. I was starting on classical things, giving papers occasionally, and writing articles on other things before that book came out. The publication schedule was not nearly so slow as it is now, because there were not that many books coming out. I finished the manuscript for my first book, on the portraits, and defended in 1952, and the book came out in 1953. Nobody has that kind of luck

now; it may be five years after it goes in and is accepted before something comes out.

SMITH: What kinds of discussions were taking place in the school about archaic and archaistic sculpture? What were the problematics that were concerning people?

HARRISON: Well, part of the problematics was always—and you may think this is boring—dates.

SMITH: I don't think it's boring, I think it's fundamental.

HARRISON: It was in that period that I got to know Ann [Lilian H.] Jeffery very well, and she was working on inscriptions of archaic grave monuments which included both kouroi and the grave stelai. She had worked with Raubitschek on the monuments of the Acropolis, and she was working away on what became her great work, which was *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*. So I had a wonderful time together with her on these things where there was sculpture connected with inscriptions—what the sculpture sequence suggested to me as a date and what the letter forms and other aspects of language and so forth suggested to her about the dates. We had very good agreement and it tended to lower a lot of the generally accepted dates.

SMITH: "Lower" meaning making more recent?

HARRISON: Making more recent, yes, and it also was an experience for me in how these things work.

SMITH: What kind of response did you get to your dating?

HARRISON: From the reviewers I got a very pleased response. Not that everybody was going to accept it, because they don't, but Brunilde Ridgway was very happy to have the dates lowered.

SMITH: Given that evidence by its very nature is tentative, what would be the reasons for one set of scholars to be very "happy," quote unquote, about a lower set of dates and another set of scholars to be not so happy?

HARRISON: Well, you are naturally trying to connect these things with their historical periods, and I think it would have been particularly Miss Richter from whom I had learned these ideas in that seminar that I mentioned, who would connect for example the earliest big marble kouroi with the period of the rich landed aristocrats who preceded the reforms of Solon, and then she would see a kind of gap. She didn't put a lot of material into this period of about 590 to 470 or 480. In her chronology she did these things in groups, and she made a whole intermediate group of what to some other people seemed to be lower quality and provincial material contemporary with what was her next group. So that kind of thing happened. And all of this worked together, so then you would have a slightly different picture of who the people were who were spending the money for all this. Were they the landed aristocracy, or were they the people who were starting to be involved in trade; their imitation of things that were being done in the islands would have to do with that. All of those remained, as you would say, problematic. I suppose either [John] Boardman

or Dietrich might have mentioned the attempts of Michael [J.] Vickers and David Francis to—

LYONS: They did not mention it.

HARRISON: This is something that happened recently. These two scholars just decided something on the basis of their wanting one historical event to match up with one thing that happened, actually, in vase painting. On the basis of this they just pulled out all the cornerstones, or what we had thought were cornerstones all along, like the date of the Siphnian treasury at Delphi that seemed to have a kind of relationship to the time when red-figure vase painting began. There was a symposium on this, which Henry Immerwahr, a specialist in archaic writing and vases, was chairing. These scholars got up and presented their reasons—why you couldn't be sure of this and you couldn't be sure of that, and so forth. Then there was a discussion, and finally, Henry said, "Now I understand why you can say that it doesn't have to be the way we want it, but why do you want it the way you want it?" Then they came out with this: "Well, for historical reasons it seems to us that the *Sack of Troy* by the Kleophrades Painter should follow the Persian sack of Athens." Well, okay, that was their historical event, but of course there was another historical event almost ten years before which had made a tremendous impression on the Athenians, which was the sack of Miletus, and so they were just choosing. They had this historical desire. So this is what makes people happy and unhappy with a change of

dates. If you do want to have a general picture, if art history has anything to do with history, then you like to visualize what the people are experiencing, what they have been recently feeling and so forth, when they go in for a certain kind of art.

SMITH: How would one be able to test the hypothesis of the sack of Miletus versus the sack of Athens, versus perhaps another event?

HARRISON: The only way that you can test it is by the objects in their contexts and their sequence. Of course what the vase painting people had done with Beazley as the leader, was to build up a close continuous network of workshops, pupils, and so forth, that gave you a lot more continuity in your relative sequence than you could get in any of these other fields, so that became very useful to connect. But if you're going to throw that out and switch it all around, then it doesn't seem to work. Rather recently [Theodore] Leslie Shear, [Jr.]—this is the son Leslie Shear, a very thorough scholar—went through all of what seemed to be Persian destruction contexts in the Agora and listed all the kinds of pottery that was in them, and because of this I think that Vickers has probably sort of backed off—Francis died. Vickers wouldn't say that he's changed his mind, he's just interested in other things now. Nothing is ever proven, as you know, in archaeology, but Shear just went back and got all these contexts. Where and how these things were thrown away indicated that it was Persian destruction, and he saw what it added up to.

SMITH: Has the work of the vase painters been helpful to you in terms of your work

on sculpture?

HARRISON: Oh absolutely; it's helpful in so many ways—very much in the line of knowing what people were interested in, what subjects. If you get a broken piece of sculpture that might be a mythological subject, to know whether it might be in that period or why somebody might have wanted it. [It helps] just to know what kind of clothes and haircuts heroes were wearing in a certain period to see whether a piece of sculpture could be a piece of such a hero. Not only does it have this continuity because of all the identifiable hands, but when there is a vase with a large number of figures interacting on it that is not very well preserved, it is likely that there is a companion piece that's well enough preserved that you could figure out what is going on there.

SMITH: How did you get going on your studies of Alkamenes and Pheidias?

HARRISON: Well, studies of Pheidias just grew out of my interest in the Parthenon, and I got started on that in graduate school, really, with Dinsmoor. Alkamenes came by the back door out of something else, which was the study of the sculpture on a temple that's closely connected with the Agora, the so-called Theseum. It had been first suggested in 1863 by one writer that this actually might be the temple of Athena and Hephaistos. At that time everybody sneered at this, and they said the way to prove it was to show that the sculpture was relevant. In 1899, I think, Bruno Sauer did a very thorough, very good study of all the traces on the floors where the

pedimental sculpture had been, and then without a single piece of sculpture to put in there, he decided what subject would fit, and he put some subjects in there, one of which had to do with Hephaistos, the other with Theseus. So he said that thus we were able to demonstrate it, in what at that time was considered a scholarly way. It is very ironic that sculpture was considered at that time, when people had just suggested this and it hadn't been accepted, that it was a scholarly way to demonstrate it. But later on, when they were digging in the Agora, they found bronze casting pits around that hill, and they thought, "Aha, the god of metalworkers. So this proves it!" They read in Pausanias that above or beyond what he called the Kerameikos, which was our Agora, and the Royal Stoa, there's the Temple of Hephaistos.

Then in the early 1950s a book came out by a German scholar, [Herbert] Koch, who had started much earlier to do a complete architectural publication of this building. And he came back to finish the study and meanwhile Homer Thompson had had a wonderful idea of how to restore the pediment. But by that time people didn't feel anymore that you really had to have the mythology on the temple have anything to do with the god inside; as long as it was something that the local people were proud of, you didn't have to connect it, so [Homer] put in the apotheosis of Herakles in the east pediment. And Koch said, "You see, he has shown that it's not the Temple of Hephaistos, it is a temple of Herakles and Theseus."

So that started me on thinking about this. I really didn't like the idea that the

sculpture on a temple should have nothing to do with the divinity, so I started working on the idea that it wasn't the Hephaisteion. I thought that one of the things that I needed to do to be thorough about it was to go into the question of the statues that we knew had been made; we have this inscription that the statues of Athena and Hephaistos were made. It doesn't say they were made by Alkamenes, but it is said elsewhere that Alkamenes did the Hephaistos in Athens, so it was generally accepted and I think it was right that these statues were by Alkamenes. So I thought I should study the accounts of the statues and what I got into was that the type of Athena that they had picked to use for the temple didn't fit at all; it was fourth century. The wording in the inscription referred to a flower which was made out of bronze and couldn't have been just a little floral bush that was holding up a shield by the side of the statue; it was a huge column, sort of like an acanthus column.

All of that changed [perceptions about] what should have been in that [sculptural] group, while [reinforcing] Semni Karouzou's idea that reliefs should have been on its base. So that got me into studying all of that and this long article on Alkamenes is really about that, to say what was the style of sculptures and how it might relate to Alkamenes as a member of the Parthenon workshop, etcetera. So I backed into that in that fashion. But I came out of it feeling as if Alkamenes was really more familiar to me than most of these people, and that we still don't have the foundations of the Hephaisteion.

SMITH: So you're convinced of that then?

HARRISON: Yes, I'm convinced of that. Other things have happened meanwhile that make it less likely that it is on a hill above the Royal Stoa. Pausanias says that near it is the temple of Aphrodite Ourania, and they have found over on the other side of the railroad what really does seem to me the sanctuary of Aphrodite Ourania, so that you can think the Hephaisteion ought to be over there somewhere. In any case I'm not holding out for any particular site; we just have to wait and see. But people did give up the idea that this flower was a little floral ornament and realized it took a huge amount of bronze. Whatever else they might throw away, they still have accepted this.

SMITH: And the bronze is lost?

HARRISON: It just got melted down in late antiquity. They found a lot of places in the Agora where bronze was melted down.

SMITH: I see. So what they initially thought must be part of the Hephaisteion was then just bronze being melted?

HARRISON: No, those things were actual casting pits, but the thing is that you put the casting pits on a slope, so that the updrafts of the wind help the fire to burn, so it was land that was not occupied by houses, and it was in a sanctuary.

SMITH: I see.

HARRISON: Casting pits were found not only next to this temple, but also around

the vicinity of that hill and then some of them down in the Agora too. There was a good study of all those done by Carol Mattusch, first as a North Carolina thesis, and then as a book.

SMITH: Many of your publications have been devoted to the Parthenon, which is not part of the Agora project.

HARRISON: Well, it isn't, but we found pieces of the Parthenon down there, you see. This is something that happened early in my second stay there. I found just in a marble pile a little piece of the north frieze, and then Frank Brommer came down with his project that he was working on, the pediments, and said, "Do you have anything?" And I said, "Well, I didn't think we did, but I can show you what seems to be fifth century." There was a big chunk of drapery, which I was in fact seeing the wrong way up. But Brommer went around with copies of the drawings of [Jacques] Carrey of the sculptures before they were blown up in 1867, so he was always looking for something that might be there and wasn't there anymore in what we had, and so he decided that it had to be the thigh of Amphitrite.

We looked at it and we thought that seemed possible, so we got a cast made of the broken surface of this piece in the Agora, and a cast of the figure that's in the British Museum was in the Acropolis Museum. So we took this cast up there and it fitted on. Because we weren't going to get the piece in the British Museum back to Athens, naturally, the next thing was to at least [provide] the British Museum with a

complete cast, so we made a cast and we shipped it with considerable difficulty to the British Museum. In order to get it out of Greece we had to say that this was not an ancient work, it was a modern copy, and then it got to the British customs and they said that since this was a modern work we had to pay duty on it—but eventually they got it.

But that's the way the Agora could get you into the Acropolis; there's all kinds of stuff from the Acropolis in crumbs that has come down there. Bill Dinsmoor, the younger Dinsmoor, found the fragments of the lost interior columns of the Parthenon, which people used to say were carried off to Constantinople, or whatever. He found them broken up and reused in the Agora, in a late antique context. The Agora is just so close, and we're *downhill* from the Acropolis.

[showing photographs] I was just showing the students today, because we were talking about leaning figures . . . okay, this figure. It's a Nike figure from the Nike parapet, and it was known in the nineteenth century; Flaubert made a drawing of it. A student of more recent art, Irma [B.] Jaffe at Columbia, was working on Flaubert's notebooks and manuscripts and found that. I thought this piece in the Agora was a part of a series of fragments of late fifth-century stuff that we had, but I noticed when Carpenter described this Nike, he said, "She's leaning on something, I don't know what it is," and I realized I had this fragment that was leaning on something, I didn't know what. So I got permission to take it up. In that case I could

just take the whole fragment up there and try it, and sure enough it fitted. Anything like that you could just take it up to the Acropolis and give it to them if it joins. And you would make sure they glued it on right away so that it wouldn't get lost.

SMITH: A lot of what you're doing is like a big jigsaw puzzle.

HARRISON: Yes, except that nine-tenths of it are missing. [laughter]

SMITH: How do you train yourself to be thinking, "This fragment, with this amorphous shape, will fit this other fragment with a completely different amorphous shape?"

HARRISON: Well, I didn't remember the shape of the breaks and things, but once you think, "Maybe this could be a part of it," then you can look at a picture and see if it looks probable, and you see if the scale looks probable. These days it's more formal. Usually they say you have to make a cast and take it up there and confirm the join, and then come back down and get the permission to take the actual piece up there. And then you have to get permission to transfer it. But there was this happy period when I started when the Agora and the Acropolis were in the same ephorate, and they are again now. There was a period in between when the Agora went into the third ephorate, which was that of the lower city. I didn't realize there was all this difference, so I did take something up there, and it joined and I just left it up there. Then I was scolded because I hadn't gone through the right channels, and I said, "But this is what I always did before." And Mr. [J.] Threpsiades said, "Ah, but then it was

the same ephorate." But anyhow these things do happen.

SMITH: So you spent two years in the mid-fifties at the American School?

HARRISON: Yes, '53 to '55.

SMITH: And then you came back to the United States?

HARRISON: I came back and got a job at Columbia.

SMITH: As an assistant professor?

HARRISON: Yes. That was my tenure-track job.

SMITH: In which department?

HARRISON: In the department of Fine Arts and Archaeology, as it was then called.

SMITH: So Columbia, as in many places, combined art history with archaeology?

HARRISON: Yes.

SMITH: How many other archaeologists were there working in the department at the time you were there?

HARRISON: Well, when I came there had been a double retirement because Dinsmoor had retired and Emerson Swift, the one who did Roman architecture, had retired. People who taught in Barnard or Columbia College might also be teaching in the graduate school at Columbia, so there was Marion Lawrence doing late antique, and let's see, and we had this search out the first year I was there for somebody in Roman art. I think it was two years before we actually got Otto [J.] Brendel, so he became the senior colleague and I was the junior colleague. We got Edith Porada in

Near Eastern, so that was a good combination there. There was Jane [Elizabeth] Henle, who was especially interested in mythology, and she taught an undergraduate general course in mythology that was useful to the students, but it was small; it was something that needed to be built up.

SMITH: Now that you were on the faculty side at Columbia, how did the intellectual community there strike you in terms of the classical antiquity side of things?

HARRISON: When you say the "intellectual community," I always think, "Intellectual community. Who is in it and who isn't?" Everybody would say Meyer Schapiro is in the intellectual community. Then do you say that Julius Held is in the intellectual community, or is he more like some of the others of us? I don't know. It was interesting that although I didn't feel that Meyer had any particular respect for what I did, I think what he chose to emphasize of the classical things was generally something that I thought was a good idea to emphasize. So we sort of went our own ways. We were friends, but I didn't have vigorous discussions with Meyer, because they would have been on completely different levels, you know?

SMITH: I was actually just asking more simply in terms of the people doing classical antiquity at Columbia.

HARRISON: Well, I was very close friends with the people doing classical antiquity—the ones teaching Greek and Greek history, Greek philosophy, such as Charles Kahn.

SMITH: Every university community is different for a faculty than it is for graduate students, and you had then crossed the line.

HARRISON: No, when I was a graduate student I had also taken some courses in the classics department, so that I did have the connections, so if you want to call it the intellectual community, then okay. I actually took a course with [Kurt von] Fritz on Greek political theory. But I told him that I was a novice and he sort of gave me the kind of subject that I could do and so I learned a lot.

SMITH: What subject did he give you?

HARRISON: There were two ancient texts that were representative of the conservative reaction against democracy, against democratic Athens. One is called the *Pseudo-Xenophontic Athenaion Politeia*, and that is thought to be by somebody in the late fifth century; it came down in the works of Xenophon but it wasn't Xenophon. The other one was something known as *Anonymus Iamblichi*, which meant it had come down in the works of Iamblichus, but it wasn't. I remember more about *Pseudo-Xenophon* than I do about *Anonymous Iamblichi*, but they were the kinds of complaints you could hear these days: everybody dresses the same, you can't tell who are really the good people and who are not—this kind of grumbling.

SMITH: How did the study of this Greek political theory and these texts in particular feed into your specific interests in terms of archaeology?

HARRISON: Oh, it just filled in the picture of Athens in the time.

SMITH: But did it affect the way you worked with the objects that you chose to work with, or did it affect the way you chose objects to write about?

HARRISON: No. Because I was just already into writing about the things, so these things that I learned I just fed into the knowledge surrounding the things, because ancient Athens was a small place; you didn't just pick one aspect of it and pay no attention to the other; that would be unreal.

SMITH: In the *American Journal of Archaeology* you are credited with having a great interest in the relationship of style and iconography.

HARRISON: Yes.

SMITH: Which is also of course something that Meyer Schapiro has had a great interest in.

HARRISON: But I didn't have this great interest in defining what style was, and I didn't have a great interest in distinguishing between iconography and iconology.

[For example], a [female figure] sits in the Parthenon pediment and she has twins, one on either side, and her dress is blowing wildly. Nobody else has this wild wind blowing their dress, and yet there would be people that said, "Oh well, that's just decorative, that's just style." But it isn't; it's because she is Oreithyia, the one who was carried off by the north wind and she had these twins. So that's a very simple down to earth way of doing it, but certainly at the time when I started there was a great tendency for people to say that these thin draperies and these blowing cloaks

were just something to decorate the sculpture and make it look pretty.

[Tape III, Side Two]

HARRISON: You had to realize there was more to it than that, it had to be what was going on and who the people were. Although I would never get into a direct argument with a poststructuralist or even with a structuralist, the things that they point out and the kinds of things that they find happening elsewhere can be very illuminating for similar things happening in the Greek world. In particular what has been most useful are the [studies] about the processes—the rites and the fashions and the ways of doing things—that surround the growing up of young people that become integrated into the local society. Such a huge proportion of art has to do with this, that when these people start feeding you parallels you're very happy to make use of them to the extent that you can.

SMITH: What's "the extent that you can"? Do you have boundaries beyond which you feel uncomfortable?

HARRISON: No, the boundary beyond which you can't go is the boundary beyond which somebody says, "Oh no, that doesn't apply," and they explain why it doesn't. You can start out assuming that there are things that go on being similar for a long time, and then you find out whether they really are or not. And you certainly find out that there are these periodical throwbacks to earlier things: we really have to have special training for our children; they really have to have some ceremony where they

put on their special clothes and it is recognized that they are grown up—all of those things. You can use them in a very broad sense as parallels.

SMITH: Since you brought up structuralism and poststructuralism I guess we might as well pursue that. What was your response to the "new archaeology," as it started to emerge in the mid-sixties? What did you feel was useful and what was not useful?

HARRISON: It was useful when people that took an anthropological point of view and had an anthropological interest would go into the classical period, where there is literature and inscriptions that provide evidence for kinship patterns—what they meant and what went on—and then they would write articles in a journal like the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, or something like that. Sally [Sarah C.] Humphreys is one who has written very useful things. With those kinds of people I would get a lot out of it. With [Colin] Renfrew I would just have arguments for the sake of arguments, which he would cheerfully engage in—this was when he was younger.

SMITH: What kind of arguments?

HARRISON: Well, for example, he just didn't see why Greek archaeologists didn't use culture names for periods instead of using names like Early Minoan, or whatever. So I said, "What is the advantage, and what would you want as a culture name?" He said that [the period name could be based on] the place where a certain style of pottery turned up, so the Early Helladic period could be the Zygouries period. Then I said, "What about Lerna?" He said, "Well, the Middle Helladic could be the Lerna

period." Well, that is ridiculous in that the early Helladic was much more impressive in its remains and Lerna was a more important place in that period. So I didn't see it; it was a silly kind of argument. Then we had arguments about identification of marble, which neither of us were really very much on top of.

SMITH: You mean just the technical aspects, like where the marble came from?

HARRISON: Where the marble came from; and that has gotten ahead of both of us, but I think I'm more interested in that now than he is. And then Renfrew started writing about the Indo-Europeans, and I have never been able to get terribly excited with the Indo-Europeans. I know that they are there, but they get awfully diluted with all these people they come through.

SMITH: Yes, whoever the Indo-Europeans are. Of course, with the rise of feminism there has been a whole new way of looking at classical society; have you found any of that useful?

HARRISON: I find some of it useful, but a lot of it is the other way around because usually it's people who know more literature, but they really don't know the art very well, like Eva Keuls, and they have this tremendous theory. They publish a book which is read by lots of undergraduates, and it's full of pictures of things, some of them wrongly labeled, some of them fakes—all kinds of stuff all scrambled up—and then you have to sort of sweep that out of the students' minds and get back to some realities. You get driven to read some of the basic French [literature], and there is

Nicole Loraux, who has written about the Athenians and their invention of their own identity. All of these people get into the fact that the Athenians allowed women very little freedom and not as much status as they had in other places. You keep picking it up from people saying it in papers that they present: the Athenian women were not allowed to be called "Athenians." And that is startling when you have in your head an inscription for the appointment for the first priestess of Athena Nike, and it says, "She shall be appointed from among all the Athenian women," meaning it was not a hereditary priesthood, so it is *pasōn*—which is feminine—*Atheaiōn*. So Nicole, having said in the first edition [of her book] that Athenian women were not allowed to be called Athenian women, [was questioned by] one of her French colleagues, who said, "What about this inscription?" And Nicole said, "Oh, you can't really use something from an inscription where the reading has been restored." But this was just off the top of her head, because she never restored this kind of inscription, which is called a Stoichedon inscription. All the letters in one line are right under the letters [above]; whether they're thick letters or thin letters, there are the same number of letters in every line. So it's *pasōn* there, and the *Athe* [on the next line]. You can't put *panton*, which would be "all of them," masculine; you can only put *pasōn*, otherwise it wouldn't fit. So you get into all these kooky little backwaters, and I'm still pursuing this subject of Athenian women not being allowed to be called Athenians.

SMITH: To me that's interesting because on the one hand there's a theory that's driving a revision of how people look at Athenian society. In this case it's a feminist theory, but it could also be a gay theory, or a kind of Indo-European theory; there are just these theories that are out there.

HARRISON: Yes, and the theories being out there make you look at things more closely. I would love to give a seminar on Amazons, but I would be afraid to because I would not get the good, sharp, well-trained students that I get if I just give a seminar on attribution of sculpture in the fourth century. I would get all of these people who don't read Greek and have read these funny books, and I wouldn't be able to control what they did; it would be a mess. But it would be a wonderful subject for a seminar if you could just get the right people in it.

LYONS: Along the same lines I was wondering if students of yours have read or are engaged with [Martin Bernal's] book *Black Athena*, and if that became a debate in your classes?

HARRISON: That doesn't come up very much because I think *Black Athena* has this sort of odd notion that we don't attribute anything to the Egyptians and the Semitic people, and of course we do. So you just kind of let it go along the side; it's not a big thing to spend a lot of time on. The backlash to that kind of stuff is a little more annoying, which is the Western tradition business, and I think that is kind of threatening to us.

SMITH: Do you mean like the Allen Bloom stuff?

HARRISON: Yes, that kind of stuff.

LYONS: There was a donor at Yale who wanted a western civilization course—

HARRISON: Yes, well I was just thinking now about the donor at Yale. Jerry [Jerome] Pollitt said that he was actually dean when that money was first offered and they accepted it, but they had no idea it would ever come to the point where the donors would be wanting to vet the faculty. A respectable university can't do that; you just don't.

SMITH: On the one hand there's all this theory that is out there in the world now, and then on the other hand there's a more traditional archaeological approach, which is puzzle solving in the sense you were talking about.

HARRISON: Well, the theory is a puzzle too, isn't it? I mean, you have an abstraction and you're going around looking for the support for it.

SMITH: But theory to be theory has to be internally logically coherent, so it doesn't matter if the external facts fit it or not.

HARRISON: Yes, to that extent, then, theory doesn't affect us at all, but people who purport to be doing theory sometimes do good and sometimes not. Just to have [pure] feminist theory . . . it's kind of hard to see what can come out of it. I mean you may have a feminist agenda, I can understand that, but feminist theory is not—

SMITH: Except that a feminist theory would say that the social male-female relations

must be of this basic structural type, and so on and so forth.

HARRISON: But they are going after it in certain places; they would name places where this was going on, you see?

SMITH: And yet it has to be fit into a tradition that means you've got these letters that are underneath each other—a grid of letters—and you don't have all of them, but your reconstruction is then limited by the fact that there's a grid, and it's got to be grammatical and it's got to be semantically consistent.

HARRISON: Of course you're talking now about the grid of the theory, but the grid of the inscription I guess does have a theory that you have to proceed on, which is that they didn't make any mistakes carving the inscription. That is not a theory that can absolutely be agreed on, but you also know that miscarved letters are not for the most part going to happen in ordinary formulas; they don't happen that often. Correct epigraphical method says it is incorrect to restore a stonecutter's error, and yet you know that stonecutter's errors occur, so you just either say, "I give up," or you break the tradition and say, "I'm sure he did this wrong." But usually it's a case where you just see the error and sometimes he saw it and corrected it too.

SMITH: Have these new theories that have developed—the new archaeology and feminist approaches to scholarship and so forth—affected the students who have come to you and the kinds of projects they've wanted to work on?

HARRISON: Yes, I have a student now who is doing a re-study of the Acropolis

korai. She is doing it with a lot more attention to what these girls represent, and what their dress and their hair and the rest of it might have to do with that, and who the donors would have been and the whole thing. So you can get subjects where you're studying things directly relating to women, and the fact that people are interested means that you can get more of a hearing on this kind of thing.

SMITH: In your mind what is the balance between evidence based on the physical object and evidence that's based in the texts? And then also evidence that I guess is contextual—where the stuff comes from?

HARRISON: You can't do without any of them. The new archaeology is really based on how you treat things when you don't have any texts, and you do know where the stuff comes from in quite a bit of detail, like whether a room was a kitchen or a bedroom, and who was living there and how that affected the things found, and all those things. So you can take some of that kind of knowledge and apply it to a site, say, in the Argolid. Michael Jameson has done this kind of thing. Where you have some of the written history and you have some inscriptions, you can then dig it up and because you have this new kind of interest you pay more attention to what you find in every room and to lesser indications of different kinds of use: seeds and weeds and mouse bones and all of the rest.

SMITH: Okay, back to your teaching. You stayed at Columbia until?

HARRISON: 1970.

SMITH: Then you went to Princeton. Why did you decide to go to Princeton?

HARRISON: I was attracted by the fact that Princeton had a joint program between Art and Archaeology and the Classics department, and that the students had to be strong in both. I thought that that was just what I wanted. I wasn't disenchanted with Princeton at all, and I had good students there, but I didn't get exactly what I had hoped to get, because the ones who were strong enough in the languages and literature to get into this program very often hadn't had enough of concentrated *looking at things* to keep from being afraid of [that aspect] of it. Similarly, the ones on the other side were afraid of the languages, so they had already sort of specialized themselves before they ever got to graduate school. Nevertheless, I can think of somebody like Susan Rotroff, who was a total exception; she was equally strong on all fronts.

I wasn't really planning to leave Princeton, although I found it easier to live in New York, but I got an offer from the Institute of Fine Arts, and I thought this was what I really wanted because these were graduate students and even though I would get some that didn't have languages, they would be committed to graduate study, and if they were committed enough then they would learn what they had to learn.

Particularly I got more of the kind of students that could do their own drawing, those that might have thought of being artists, who were visually strong in that way.

SMITH: This is a place that would strike me as being much more art history focused

than your positions at either Columbia or Princeton, even if you were in the same department as the art historians.

HARRISON: Well, at Columbia you would also get the art historians in your classes, and at Princeton too, but in Princeton there were not as many art historians. The student body was smaller, and I only had upper-level art historians. Some of them were very good.

SMITH: How does being situated in the Institute change the kind of intellectual community that you are part of? Or does it?

HARRISON: Yes, it sort of narrows it—just because I don't go out to lunch with somebody from the philosophy department and this kind of thing. I go up to Columbia still, to the university seminars and there's one in classical studies. The classical studies seminar has become much less archaeological than it used to be, but I get a lot out of it all the same. There was a woman who talked about Herodotos and the gods, and Herodotos saying that the Egyptians were the first to give names to the gods, and this whole question feeds into a lot of things that are of interest in art and not just in classical literature and history.

SMITH: I'd like to get a sense of your approach to teaching, and if there's a repertoire of classes that you have.

HARRISON: Yes, I have a repertoire, and this I really got from Columbia and just kept it, because it seemed to work for what the students needed. As a matter of fact,

[Peter Heinrich von] Blanckenhagen was doing something like that also, and that was to have a cycle of lecture courses where in three or four lectures you covered the field you were doing in a general way. My cycle is called Sculpture, but a lot of vase painting gets smuggled in: archaic, fifth century, and fourth century; and Blanckenhagen did Hellenistic and Roman in two divisions. Bert Smith, who has just left us, kept that cycle. Then the seminars can be whatever you feel like doing at a certain time, and there are some that I repeat. I repeat the Parthenon every now and then because the Parthenon material piles up so much you need rearguard action on it, and you need to get on top of what you can and can't say about it. I have several times done a dress seminar, which is very useful and you get good things out of it, but you get the odd phenomenon that few people actually take it for credit; most of them audit. Not even the gay men will take it for credit; it's a very funny thing. Then there are a few other courses that I do. The one I'm doing now I hadn't done before, and I might not again.

SMITH: This is attribution?

HARRISON: Yes, because there is such a wide difference between the people who carry on a tradition of concentrating on the named sculptors as carriers of the knowledge of their period and people who say, "Well, let's just sweep them away and look at the overall development." Ridgway is very strong on that side and general German tradition remains on the other side. I would just like to do something in

between. Taking fourth-century sculptors, you start with the family of Praxiteles, where you've got a few originals and a few sure attributions, and some epigraphical evidence, in addition to great flourishing, in the case of Praxiteles, of too much literary stuff. But anyhow you can see what you can have some confidence about, and where you cannot have any, and I think this is useful for everybody. In cases where you can't attribute something to anybody, you have to be interested in placing it in time and interested in its iconography and you should not feel cheated because you have something that doesn't certainly belong to one of these named sculptors.

SMITH: If a student wants to work with you, do you have limits as to the kind of project that you'll work on?

HARRISON: Yes, my limit is [the point where] I feel that I'm not competent to tell whether the work is any good or not.

SMITH: Maybe it happens more often in a public university, but sometimes you feel like you're getting pushed against the margins of your knowledge, because someone's retired—

HARRISON: When you're pushed against the margins like that, you have to rely on colleagues, and sometimes you have to get a colleague from outside your university to take an interest in this dissertation. I think we work pretty well that way.

SMITH: We could ask you about some of your students, but I think actually that that is probably less interesting than asking you about who your peers were that you felt

most intellectually and affinitively close to, the people whose interactions were most important either directly or indirectly to puzzling out the problems that you posed for yourself?

HARRISON: Well, you've talked to two of them: John Boardman and Dietrich [von Bothmer]. I've mentioned Ann Jeffery, who was somewhat older, but still we were as peers. Edith Porada very much, because she was interested at least in the early Greek stuff, and I'm interested in Near Eastern and Egyptian as being always there on the horizon of Greek art. Some literary people—Martin Ostwald, who is a literary historian. Michael Jameson I think I mentioned. Charles Kahn, who is now at Penn in philosophy, was a person I could always talk to about things; he would take an interest in something that might be an archaeologist's problem but he would know how to read something that a philosopher said. Erika Simon very much, and for a long time. And we've already talked about Bruni [Brunilde S. Ridgway].

SMITH: I think Claire has a few more questions about her.

LYONS: Her name came up, but we haven't really characterized the differences in your approaches and your relationship with her.

HARRISON: Well, the biggest difference is this: she carries Carpenter's approach to the extreme of not wanting to try to consider the individual sculptors, and not wanting to use copies as sources. She can get the students stirred up to a very healthy skepticism, and then, usually, when they are out on their own they take a

more catholic, or protestant, position. But that is the difference. She looks at something and gets an impression instantaneously; she doesn't look at it and doubt what she's seeing and go back and look some more, and go all the way around it. She doesn't waste a lot of time on that kind of activity. I think that not having actually been a digging archaeologist is also [part of it]. She hasn't had that particular kind of experience where you are just presented with this thing, and you've got to do something with it; you can't just say, "Oh, I think that it's late, not my period," and throw it back in the ground. [laughter]

LYONS: Did you have debates with her on specific points?

HARRISON: Yes, until we got to a point where she thought we were debating too much and she didn't want to anymore, and then we had several years when we didn't have any communications on such subjects. We had a lot of debates. There were the Riache warriors, and there was your own Getty kouros.

LYONS: Yes, you've come down on separate sides of the fence on that issue.

HARRISON: Where she finally didn't want to argue with me anymore was about Aphrodisias—these sculptures that they found that belonged to the Julio/Claudian and Flavian period, and these things are partly unfinished, but such that they therefore show in places a very rough kind of workmanship. [Bruni] decided along with Gloria [Ferrari] Pinney that these were late antique works. She did not want to accept what the epigraphists said and she finally just said she didn't want to argue with me

anymore on scholarly subjects. I think I do have a tendency to be rather tenacious, but there are people you can do that with. I could do it with Mabel Lang, and we enjoyed it; she was a person that liked occasionally to make outrageous remarks to spur you into an argument, but then you could enjoy the argument for itself. Bruni is not quite like that. But I have learned a lot from her, and I think she would even say that she has learned some things from me.

LYONS: What about Andrew Stewart?

HARRISON: Andy Stewart I consider as a younger colleague; I wouldn't call him my contemporary. He's come along very fast. Of course Bruni is younger, too. She and John Boardman are about the same age. I have gotten a lot out of Andy Stewart's book; it's very useful, especially for the students, but also for looking things up. And just useful for putting out in front things about the life of sculptors, their economic situations and all of that. Andy Stewart, however, is not tenacious in his arguments; he will just throw these things out, and if you say, "No, I don't think so," he'll say, "Oh, but . . .," and you have a friendly exchange with him, but I don't think of cases where I would go to Andy Stewart and say, "Can you help me with this?" He knows a lot more literature than I do, but I can always go to a literary person for that. He organized a very nice symposium at the College Art Association one time about art in the time of the Peloponnesian War, and that was very interesting. He had a good idea and he put it together well and got people that could fight together

happily.

LYONS: What about Evelyn Smithson, who is in an entirely different field? You mentioned her very briefly.

HARRISON: With Evelyn it was somewhat like Edith Porada, because Evelyn was dealing with the dark ages, that is, the Protogeometric time. It was a world that I wanted to know about, but it was on the fringes. I wouldn't have tried to teach that. So I would learn about it from her, as I would learn about the Near Eastern things from Edith, but her interest in sculpture was just very general; when I had real discussions with her it was about her material.

SMITH: What are you working on now, if I can ask?

HARRISON: Well, there are always various things. One of them is an Agora book that has some stuff in it that I was working on in the 1950s and it hasn't come out yet and has been nearly finished for a long time. Right now I'm getting some other stuff swept out of the way. I did finish an article on Pheidias for a book that Jerry Pollitt is editing, so that's out of the way. I guess that the next thing, really, is to get back to this Agora [material]. Meanwhile, there are torsos of articles, things I've given papers about that I would like to write up, and it's only when somebody comes around and pokes you to be in a symposium or in a festschrift that you do it.

LYONS: I like that: "torso of an article."

HARRISON: What else would you call it—a *bozzo*? It has some parts that are really

finished, but it has to have the head and feet put on yet. One of those articles is about dress, but it's a kind of dress that has a lot of interpretations, and it involves all kinds of things: heroes, Amazons, giants. From about the late fifth century on workmen are shown wearing this particular garment, which was fastened on only one shoulder. According to [Frank] Brommer, Hephaistos is not shown wearing it at the time when the statues were made and people have always taken a certain type that is wearing it to be *the* type, and that is wrong. There is a figure on the shield of Athena Parthenos that is wearing it and people used to say, "Oh, that ought to be the portrait of Pheidias, because he is wearing this dress." But in that period it isn't the dress of a workman, it is the dress of some of the ancient heroes when they fight, so he's one of the ancient heroes. As far as I can see, that type of dress starts out being used for foreigners, and then for these enemies, like the giants, and for people who are wounded or vulnerable, and then just for heroes of early times, which is what you've got in the Parthenon, with some of these magnificent people controlling horses and so forth. Dietrich von Bothmer showed long ago that in the fifth century Amazons wear it only when they're wounded. It's not the characteristic dress of an Amazon, except when they are among the wounded, vulnerable people. Then in the fourth century it seems to get more generalized again, and by the Hellenistic-Roman times Amazons can just wear it indiscriminately. I haven't gotten that far, and I wouldn't try in this article to get that far.

[Tape IV, Side One]

SMITH: Your aim is partly to [challenge] some of the wrong interpretations.

HARRISON: Yes, such as, "This must be Daedalus because he is wearing this," or this must be Pheidias in the guise of Daedalus because he is wearing this."

SMITH: Are those kinds of interpretations what one might call speculations, or do they have a more substantial basis?

HARRISON: They have a basis in iconography that's being projected back from Roman paintings into that period.

SMITH: So part of your task then has been a sort of chronology of iconography?

HARRISON: It always is, because iconography is a language which changes with time. Now I'm quoting the beginning of one of my lectures, but iconography is not a code, it is a language.

SMITH: Well, that's a whole debate in itself, because of the question of semiotics and all that. Has semiotics been something that you've looked into?

HARRISON: Semiotics seems to me a definition of the method rather than actually a method, wouldn't [you say]? If you were talking about what all this means, what is this a sign of, that would be *semiotic*, but it isn't *semiotics*.

SMITH: Right, yes.

HARRISON: So I have not gone into learning the vocabulary of semiotics or of most of these other theories.

SMITH: Have you been an adviser to either museums or private collectors, in terms of Greek sculpture?

HARRISON: I keep away from it as much as possible. At least twice, I have consented to look at something a private collector bought because he thought it might be a fake and he had to have somebody look at it in order to try to get his money back. I will not consent to help a museum or a collector on something which they are considering buying. And the reason for this is that one of two things [happens]: either it's a fake, and then people are annoyed with you, or it's real, and if you tell them it's real, and it's something in my field which no one already knows about, then it's stolen. This is why I wouldn't go look at the Getty kouros as long as it was on the market—or at least I said I wouldn't. I did actually look at it at a certain point.

SMITH: So you peeked.

HARRISON: Arthur Houghton was showing a group of us around the collection, and then he went into the basement and there was a [statue] with a cloth on top of it, and he whisked it away and said, "Well, there it is; it's not ours yet." And I said, "Well, I'm glad to hear that." He said, "But it will be in two weeks." So I told him why I was sorry to hear that it would be theirs in two weeks, and what I didn't like about it. But I didn't want to do that either way.

But at another time I saw something that was genuine, and it was a hot Doryphoros. The Doryphoros is a type of statue copied from Polykleitos, and

everybody believes that it is Polykleitos and there are many, many copies of it in various degrees of quality and preservation. So this statue was in New York, in the keeping of a Mr. Ternbach, who was a restorer. He had put it in his garage in Queens. It had been offered to the Raleigh Museum, and they were very much interested, but they were also suspicious because the price seemed reasonable, and they thought, "Why little Raleigh? If it's real why aren't they selling it to the Met, or somewhere else?"

I think Ariel Hermann had looked at it, and a few other people, so I went and looked at it, and it was a good copy of the Doryphoros. It was said to have been found in the sea; it had this funny kind of deposit on the front that was supposed to have been from the seawater. I looked around it and in the back of it were root marks, so I didn't think it had been found in the sea, and I didn't think it had been in an old Swiss collection, because nothing had been done to the surface, no smoothing, polishing, or anything. It was like something that had very recently come out of the ground and it was a perfectly good copy, so I phoned them and I said that it was a good statue, and it was genuine, but I thought that their trustees ought to know there might be a problem about the provenance.

After a while they phoned me back and they said, "We asked the dealer if it was all right to contact the Greek authorities, and he said, 'Yes, go ahead.' Then we asked him if it was all right to contact the Italian authorities and he said, 'No.'" So

they decided not to get mixed up in it. It then went to Munich, and the Munich museum was very eager to buy it. Meanwhile the Italians brought a lawsuit that it had been stolen from Baiae, which would explain its deposit, which was a freshwater spring deposit, and it was a good copy in pentelic marble because they were making them in Baiae. All of that made perfect sense, but they couldn't prove it.

Nevertheless the Bavarian state didn't feel like it was a good idea for the Munich museum to buy it, so with much reluctance they let it go. The dealer took it to Israel and kept it there a while, and then he sold it to the Minneapolis Museum.

SMITH: Which is where it's at now?

HARRISON: Yes. They had great celebrations and symposia about Polykleitos and they kept inviting me to come and give a paper on the relation of Pheidias to Polykleitos. But all that we had done was just to abet this whole thing by saying it was genuine. So, you know, "let them be afraid it's a fake" is my theory.

LYONS: Other colleagues must disagree with your firm stance.

HARRISON: Oh, lots of colleagues disagree. The vase painting colleagues all disagree, and the Roman portrait colleagues are not too strongly in agreement.

LYONS: So you uphold the *AJA* stance on this sort of thing?

HARRISON: I do. The things that have been stolen from the Agora have never turned up, and I think they were stolen by low-level people as a target of opportunity, and then they got scared when the police were looking for these things, so they just

got thrown down a well or destroyed. We haven't lost a lot, but from Aphrodisias they lose things all the time, and in one season Bert Smith twice walked down Madison Avenue and saw an Aphrodisias piece in the window.

SMITH: What do you do in that situation? Can you call the police?

HARRISON: Well, in that situation it was great because the Turkish people were here having a lawsuit with the Met, and so they were right on hand and they could jump right in and the dealers gave in very quickly.

SMITH: Is the question of fakes something that has concerned you, I mean how to determine whether a stone is real or not?

HARRISON: Yes, it does concern me, because every time you accept one you are gaining a piece of misleading evidence in your source material.

SMITH: I may have misphrased the question. How difficult is it for you to determine whether something is real or a fake?

HARRISON: It depends on whether it's the kind of thing that I've worked with a lot or whether it isn't. There are no general principles that are going to tell you whether it's a fake.

SMITH: You have to work with each piece individually then?

HARRISON: If it's the kind of thing that you have seen before, then you just have to see what looks wrong about it, something that you can't imagine an ancient sculptor doing that, or the ancient earth having produced that effect on its surface and so forth.

You get tired of talking about them after a while, nevertheless it's interesting.

Whenever anybody goes on to this question about giving opinions, then I'm ready to jump in and say what I think, because a lot of people just feel you give your scholarly opinion, and that is somehow an abstract thing, but it isn't; it has an economic and otherwise, effect, and basically it's just encouraging these people. But there was a nice man in Chicago, a friend of Martin Robertson, who had bought something. He sent pictures to Martin and Martin didn't like the looks of it, so he asked me to go and look at it, and I looked at it, there was no question: it was no good. Several other people looked at it, and only one out of about four people that looked at thought it had a chance to be ancient, so the man got his money back. And I think that was right.

SMITH: Have you continued to go back to the school in Athens? I think you said earlier this morning that you don't particularly like fieldwork, but have you continued that?

HARRISON: When I say I don't like fieldwork I just mean that I have never really become a digging expert, but I am always down there in the summer to see what they've found, and I even go out and see something sticking out of the edge of the trench or whatever, if they're excited and want to know about it. I do go almost every summer because if you're doing more things you have to go back and look at them. Also the library there is better calculated to have all the stuff that I need for the

kind of work I do.

SMITH: I wanted to ask you another question about when you were a young person in Athens, the community life. We talked a little bit about the gender aspect of that, but it also struck me that part of your answer was that in some ways maybe income or class was even more important in terms of where people wound up—some people having much much more money than others. Was it an egalitarian community, or did people split off into different strata?

HARRISON: You mean within the school?

SMITH: Within the school, yes.

HARRISON: No, that's a very egalitarian community, wouldn't you say?

LYONS: Yes. As long as you have something interesting or important to offer, everyone will listen and be interested I think.

HARRISON: And people don't necessarily even know how much money the others have, because you tend to dress in a somewhat similar way while you are doing the things you do there.

SMITH: And the social life in the evening?

HARRISON: I think that when we were there there were few of us and as I've said that there was only one man and he was married and his wife was there. We did socialize with Greek friends more than the American students do now, by and large, because there are so many of them and they have more strictly American parties than

we used to. So we socialized with our Greek friends and we socialized with the British school.

LYONS: That's something we haven't talked about—some of the members of the foreign schools that you may have had encounters with.

HARRISON: Oh yes. I should have mentioned [Jean] Marcadé among the people that I had a good exchange with. He's a sculpture man at the French school who is about my age; he might be a couple of years older. In the German school the people had more of a tendency to come and go. I did know [Klaus] Vierneisel and Barbara Vierneisel-Schlörb when they were there. Also Werner Fuchs was there because he came wanting to study things in the Agora. He's a bit older, but essentially of the same generation.

LYONS: The Italian scholars?

HARRISON: Italian scholars, not particularly. I knew [Antonio] Giuliano, but we were not that close.

SMITH: Homer Thompson had mentioned that for him, one of the most important aspects of daily life at the Agora project was the afternoon tea.

HARRISON: Oh yes.

SMITH: Where people simply got together and talked. Did you go to those?

HARRISON: Oh yes, because everybody was there. It was more important than lunch, which we also had together until the time we moved into the Stoa of Attalos

because everyone had finished digging for the day and so at teatime if there were goodies that somebody was going to display or brag about if they couldn't display them, that would get communicated, and then people like the Beazleys when they were in town, would come. One of the great nonjoys of being young in the Agora was that when Beazley came to look at the pottery with Lucy Talcott, Lady Beazley sat and had tea and heckled us. I don't know if Dietrich told you any Lady Beazley stories.

SMITH: No, he didn't, not one.

HARRISON: Well, diplomats and various people like that would come in and on Wednesdays they had tours and anybody could come, and we took turns leading those tours around. I was doing it one day when John Steinbeck was on the tour, and he said, "Is there a toilet here?" And I said, "Yes, but it's back up the stairs." He said, "No, I don't need it now. I just need to know for later on." So I said, "Okay, when we go back there to tea." So we got up there, and we went into the dining place where the tea was, and he said to me, "You remember your promise?" and I said, "Yes, this way," and we went off. People were sure that I was showing John Steinbeck some special thing and they all jumped up and came after us and I had to wave them away. The brother of Isadora Duncan came once, not to tea but he just came.

SMITH: Dietrich had a photograph of the brother of Isadora Duncan.

HARRISON: Did he? In his Greek dress?

SMITH: Yes.

HARRISON: The doorman came up and announced that there was an American there in native dress, and we couldn't imagine; we thought it might be somebody with Indian feathers, but there was this man with sandals. [laughter]

SMITH: Do you have any further questions? Is there something that we've failed to ask you that is very important?

HARRISON: No, I was thinking after this morning that we hadn't said enough about the school as the school, but I think we have now.

LYONS: Were you ever on the administrative committees?

HARRISON: Yes, I was on the executive committee at one point and I was at one point the chairman of the personnel committee, which is not a favorite thing to be; you're always in the middle of the fights. I've been on the publication committee a couple of times; I'm just going off now, so this will be the last time I should think.

SMITH: Well, thank you very much.

HARRISON: Thank you for working so hard on the material that we got through.

INDEX

American School of Classical Studies
at Athens, 13, 50, 62
Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture,
48–50

Barnard College, 6–13, 62
Beazley, John Davidson, 21, 38, 54, 91
Benjamin, Anna S., 32, 33
Bernal, Martin, 70
Bieber, Margarete, 9, 10, 21, 22,
26–27, 29, 47
Binder, Judith, 33
Blanckenhagen, Peter Heinrich von, 76
Blegen, Carl W., 49–50
Bloom, Allen, 71
Boardman, John, 52–53, 78, 80
Bothmer, Dietrich von, 21, 78, 82, 91
Boulter, Cedric G., 49
Brendel, Otto J., 62
Brommer, Frank, 59, 82
Bryn Mawr, 13–15, 21, 28, 29, 33, 35,
36, 40, 41

Carpenter, Rhys, 14, 15, 25, 32, 40,
41, 46–47, 48, 60, 78
Carrey, Jacques, 59
Carroll, Harry, 31
Columbia University, 8, 10, 13–14, 60,
62–63
Corpus Vasorum, 21

Day, John, 8
Dinsmoor, William B., Sr., 9, 10, 11,
13, 14, 19–20, 22, 25, 55, 60, 62

Francis, David, 53–54
Frank, Tenney, 8

Frantz, Alison, 40–41
Freer Gallery of Art, 18
Fritz, Kurt von, 64
Fuchs, Werner, 90

Gildersleeve, Virginia Crocheron,
12–13, 17
Giuliano, Antonio, 90
Goldman, Hetty, 36
Hadas, Moses, 26
Harrison, William Byrd (father), 1, 2,
3, 4, 6
Harrison, Eve Detamore (mother),
1–2, 4
Hawes, Harriet Boyd, 37
Held, Julius, 63
Henle, Jane Elizabeth, 63
Hermann, Ariel, 85
Highet, Gilbert, 36
Hirst, Gertrude, 7, 10, 13
Houghton, Arthur, 84
Humphreys, Sarah C., 67

Immerwahr, Henry, 53
Institute for Advanced Study, 41
Institute of Fine Arts (NYU), 15, 74,
75

Jaffe, Irma B., 60
Jameson, Michael, 37, 73, 78
Jeffery, Lilian H., 37–38, 51, 78
Judeich, Walther, 20

Kahn, Charles, 63, 78
Keene, Donald, 36
Kelly, Isabel, 13

- Keüls, Eva, 68
 Koch, Herbert, 56
 Koehler, Ellen, 32, 33

 Lang, Mabel, 35, 80
 Lawrence, Marion, 8, 62
 Lehmann, Karl, 15–16
 Loraux, Nicole, 69

 Mahler, Jane Gaston, 19
 Marcadé, Jean, 90
 Mattusch, Carol, 59
 Meritt, Benjamin Dean, 34–35, 41–42
 Meritt, Lucy Shoe, 41–42
 Metropolitan Museum of Art, 8, 9–10, 22
 Müller, Valentin, 14, 29

 Oliver, James H., 13
 Ostwald, Martin, 78

 Pinney, Gloria Ferrari, 79
 Pollitt, Jerome, 71
 Porada, Edith, 62–63, 78, 81
Portrait Sculpture, 16–17
 Princeton University, 15, 74, 75

 Randolph-Macon Woman's College, 6
 Raubitschek, A.E., 13, 51
 Reischauer, Edwin O., 18
 Renfrew, Colin, 67–68
 Richter, G.M.A., 9, 10–11, 26–27, 52
 Ridgway, Brunilde S., 15, 51, 76–77, 78–80
 Robertson, Martin, 11, 88
 Rotroff, Susan, 74

 Sauer, Bruno, 55–56
 Schapiro, Meyer, 63, 65
 Schweitzer, Bernhard, 27

 Scully, Vincent, 45–46
 Shear, Josephine, 35
 Shear, Theodore Leslie, Jr., 54
 Shear, Theodore Leslie, Sr., 39–40
 Simon, Erika, 78
 Smith, R.R.R., 27, 76, 87
 Smithson, Evelyn, 32, 33–34, 81
 Steinbeck, John, 91
 Stewart, Andrew, 12, 80
 Swift, Emerson Howland, 25–26, 62
 Swindler, Mary Hamilton, 14, 24, 29, 31, 32

 Talcott, Lucy, 32, 38–41, 42, 91
 Thompson, Dorothy Burr, 36
 Thompson, Homer, 25, 35, 37, 40, 42–43, 48, 56
 Thompson, Margaret, 35
 Threpsiades, J., 61–62
 Toynbee, Jocelyn M.C., 26
 Travlos, John, 35

 Vanderpool, Eugene, 35, 44, 45–46
 Vickers, Michael J., 53–54
 Vierendeel, Klaus, 90
 Vierendeel-Schlörb, Barbara, 12, 90

 Weber, Hans, 16–17

